

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 06584 205 4

No. JQ 6116 1960 A11



GIVEN BY

11.8.1960 LIBRARY



HAWAII STATEHOOD

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H. R. 49

AN ACT TO ENABLE THE PEOPLE OF HAWAII TO FORM A CON-
STITUTION AND STATE GOVERNMENT AND TO BE ADMITTED
INTO THE UNION ON AN EQUAL FOOTING WITH
THE ORIGINAL STATES

S. 156

A BILL TO ENABLE THE PEOPLE OF HAWAII TO FORM A CON-
STITUTION AND STATE GOVERNMENT AND TO BE ADMITTED
INTO THE UNION ON AN EQUAL FOOTING WITH
THE ORIGINAL STATES

S. 1782

A BILL TO ENABLE THE PEOPLE OF HAWAII TO FORM A CON-
STITUTION AND STATE GOVERNMENT AND TO BE ADMITTED
INTO THE UNION ON AN EQUAL FOOTING WITH
THE ORIGINAL STATES

WASHINGTON, D. C.

MAY 1, 2, 3, 4, AND 5, 1950

Printed for the use of the Committee on
Interior and Insular Affairs





HAWAII STATEHOOD

HEARINGS

U. S. Congress, Senate, BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS
UNITED STATES SENATE
EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H. R. 49

AN ACT TO ENABLE THE PEOPLE OF HAWAII TO FORM A CON-
STITUTION AND STATE GOVERNMENT AND TO BE ADMITTED
INTO THE UNION ON AN EQUAL FOOTING WITH
THE ORIGINAL STATES

S. 156

A BILL TO ENABLE THE PEOPLE OF HAWAII TO FORM A CON-
STITUTION AND STATE GOVERNMENT AND TO BE ADMITTED
INTO THE UNION ON AN EQUAL FOOTING WITH
THE ORIGINAL STATES

S. 1782

A BILL TO ENABLE THE PEOPLE OF HAWAII TO FORM A CON-
STITUTION AND STATE GOVERNMENT AND TO BE ADMITTED
INTO THE UNION ON AN EQUAL FOOTING WITH
THE ORIGINAL STATES

WASHINGTON, D. C.

MAY 1, 2, 3, 4, AND 5, 1950

Printed for the use of the Committee on
Interior and Insular Affairs



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1950



*JQ 6115
.1950
.A4

U. S. SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

JUN 23 1950

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming, *Chairman*

JAMES E. MURRAY, Montana

HUGH BUTLER, Nebraska

SHERIDAN DOWNEY, California

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, Colorado

ERNEST W. MCFARLAND, Arizona

GUY CORDON, Oregon

CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico

ZALES N. ECTON, Montana

GLEN H. TAYLOR, Idaho

GEORGE W. MALONE, Nevada

HERBERT H. LEHMAN, New York

ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah

MILLS ASTIN, *Chief Clerk*

N. D. MCSHERRY, *Assistant Chief Clerk*

CONTENTS

Statement of—	Page
Aguiar, Manuel R., Jr., member of the Territorial senate, Kapaa, Kauai, T. H.....	397
Akana, Thelma M. (Mrs.), member of the Territorial senate, 4585 Kahala Avenue, Honolulu, T. H.....	391
Ansai, Toshio, member of the Territorial senate, Wailuku, Maui, T. H.....	251
Anthony, J. Garner, member of the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention, Castle and Cooke Building, Honolulu, T. H.....	268
Apaka, Alfred, member of the Territorial house of representatives, Hoolchua, Molokai, T. H.....	400
Blaisdell, Neal S., member of the Territorial senate, Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Honolulu, T. H.....	393
Burke, Edward R., legal adviser, Hawaii Statehood Commission (former United States Senator from Nebraska), 514 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.....	383, 485
Bush, Gavien A., member of Hawaii Statehood Commission, Post Office Box 396, Hilo, Hawaii, T. H.....	376
Chapman, Oscar L., Secretary of the Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.....	54, 67, 293
Churchill, Arthur M., 2491 S. W. Sherwood Drive, Portland, Oregon.....	496
Crawford, Fred L., United States Representative from the State of Michigan.....	144
Crossley, Randolph, president, Hawaiian Fruit Packers, Ltd., member of the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention, Castle and Cooke Building, Honolulu, T. H.....	192
Ellis, William, chairman, board of supervisors, county of Kauai, Lihue, Kauai, T. H.....	375
Ezell, Allan, member of the Territorial house of representatives, Waikapu, Maui, T. H.....	404
Farrington, Joseph R., Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.....	109, 431
Fong, Hiram A., speaker of the Territorial house of representatives, cochairman, Hawaii Legislative Hold-over Committee of 1949, 197 S. King St., Honolulu, T. H.....	187
Godbold, Wilford D., city and county attorney of Honolulu, Honolulu Hale, Honolulu, T. H.....	372
Greene, Ernest W., vice president, Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association, 731 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.....	240
Heen, William H., member of the Territorial senate, cochairman, Hawaii Legislative Hold-Over Committee of 1949, member of the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention, Hawaiian Trust Co. Building, Honolulu, T. H.....	202
Hickerson, John D., Assistant Secretary of the Department of State (in charge of the Bureau of United Nations Affairs), Washington, D. C.....	92
Houston, Victor S. K., chairman of the Hawaiian Homes Commission (former Delegate to Congress from Hawaii), 448 Lewers Road, Honolulu, T. H.....	283, 314
Itagaki, Joseph, member of the Territorial house of representatives, Wahiawa Transport Service, Wahiawa, Oahu, T. H.....	412
Kam, Frank Y., member of the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention, Frankie's Market, Honolulu, T. H.....	420
Kauhane, Charles E., member of the Territorial house of representatives, member of the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention, 159 North Hotel Street, Honolulu, T. H.....	406
Kealoha, James Kimio, chairman, board of supervisors, county of Hawaii, Hilo, Hawaii, T. H.....	373
Kefauver, Estes, United States Senator from the State of Tennessee.....	130

Statement of—Continued

Page

Kendall, C. H., secretary, Hawaiian Government Employees' Association, 1010 Alakea Street, Honolulu, T. H.	279
King, Samuel Wilder, chairman, Hawaii Statehood Commission, president, Hawaii State Constitutional Convention (former Delegate to Congress from Hawaii), 210 Hawaiian Trust Co. Building, Honolulu, T. H.	158, 276, 462
Knowland, William F., United States Senator from the State of California	100
Larcade, Henry D., Jr., United States Representative from the State of Louisiana	148
Lee, Herbert K. H., member of the Territorial senate, member of the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention, Hawaiian Trust Co. Building, Honolulu, T. H.	395
Masaoka, Mike, national legislative director, Japanese American Citizens League, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C.	423
Matsunaga, Spark Masayuki (formerly president of Disabled Veterans of Hawaii), disabled veteran of World War II, 490 B Road, Honolulu, T. H.	246
Mau, Chuck, member of board of supervisors, city and county of Honolulu, member of the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention, Hawaiian Trust Co. Building, Honolulu, T. H.	367
McGuire, Walter F., member of the Territorial house of representatives, 5344 Kalanianaʻole Highway, Honolulu, T. H.	409
Miho, Katsuro, member of Hawaii Statehood Commission, 197 South King Street, Honolulu, T. H.	377
Miyake, Noburu, member of the Territorial house of representatives, Waimea, Kauai, T. H.	410
Nobriga, Wm. J., member of the Territorial senate, 40 Haili Street, Hilo, Hawaii, T. H.	338
Noda, Steere G., member of the Territorial house of representatives, 119 North King Street, Honolulu, T. H.	417
Peterson, J. Hardin, United States Representative from the State of Florida	135-143
Pule, Akoni, member of the Territorial house of representatives, Halaula, Hawaii, T. H.	417
Richardson, Esther K. (Mrs.), member of the Territorial house of representatives, Kealahou, Hawaii, T. H.	419
Rice, Charles A., member of the Hawaii Statehood Commission, member of the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention, Lihue, Kauai, T. H.	184
Richardson, Seth W., chairman, President's Loyalty Review Board (former Assistant Attorney General of the United States), 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.	179
Sakakihara, Thomas T., member of the Territorial house of representatives, 210 Lycurgus Building, Hilo, Hawaii, T. H.	412
Sanders, J. T., legislative counsel of the National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.	197
Silva, Charles H. (Dr.), member of the Territorial senate, Kohala, Hawaii, T. H.	389
Sinclair, Gregg M. (Dr.), president of the University of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H.	213
Soares, Oliver P., chairman of the Republican Party of Hawaii, Union Trust Building, Honolulu, T. H.	282
Stainback, Ingram M., Governor of Hawaii, Iolani Palace, Honolulu, T. H.	70
Tavares, C. Nils, president of the Bar Association of Hawaii, member of the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention, Alexander and Baldwin Building, Honolulu, T. H.	255
Tsukiyama, Wilfred C., president of the Territorial senate, room 12 Campbell Block, Honolulu, T. H.	208
Velde, Harold H., United States Representative from the State of Illinois	260, 467
Walter, Francis E., United States Representative from the State of Pennsylvania	153, 469
Warren, Earl, Governor of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.	85
Weinstein, Israel, 34-35 Seventy-sixth Street, Jackson Heights, New York, N. Y.	427

Statement of—Continued

White, Henry A., president, Hawaiian Pineapple Co., member of the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention, Honolulu, T. H.	230
Wild, Urban E., president, Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, Bishop Trust Co. Building, Honolulu, T. H.	241
Williamson, John C., assistant legislative representative, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.	491
Woolaway, Arthur D., member of the Hawaii Statehood Commission, member of the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention, Makawao, Maui, T. H.	379

EXHIBITS

H. R. 49, a bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.	1
House Report No. 254 (House Committee on Public Lands), to accompany H. R. 49.	8
S. 156, a bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.	33
S. 1782, a bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.	40
Agriculture Department, official report on H. R. 49.	31
Amendments, proposed, to H. R. 49, recommended by the Hawaii Statehood Commission.	489
Annexation of Hawaiian Islands, Senate Joint Resolution 55, Fifty-fifth Congress, adopted July 7, 1898.	18
Birth rates by races, submitted by Arthur M. Churchill.	501, 505
Chamber of Commerce of Maui, T. H., resolution of.	379
Congregational Christian Churches, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.	532
Congressional investigations of Statehood for Hawaii, 1935 to 1949, record of.	116, 305
Constitutional Convention, delegates to, with their biographies.	168-178
Constitution, United States, ratification of, by the thirteen original States, their population and area.	136
Constitution, United States, States admitted into the Union since the adoption of, population and area.	136
Defense Department, official report on H. R. 49.	51
Delegates to Hawaii State Constitutional Convention, biographies of.	168-178
Economy of Hawaii Today, a report of department of business research, prepared by the Bank of Hawaii.	431, 448
Editorial comments re statehood for Hawaii, summary of.	459
Employment, statement re, by Arthur M. Churchill.	517
Federal grants-in-aid to Hawaii, summary of.	456
Federal internal revenue collections, calendar year 1949.	456
Federal Reserve System, official report on H. R. 49.	52
Governors' conference, resolutions favoring statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.	87-89
Harrison, Burr P., United States Representative from the State of Virginia, news story re Hawaii.	468
Hawaiian annexation resolution, legislative action and references to congressional debates on.	152
Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, legislative history and background on.	339
Hawaiian Homes Commission lands on all islands, summary of.	460
Hawaiian Homes Commission, opponents to, telegrams as follows:	
Aguiar, Edwin, Hilo, T. H.	332
Andrade, John, Haina, T. H.	334
Andrade, Rose (Mrs.), Honokaa, T. H.	334
Andrade, William, Honokaa, T. H.	333
Antone, Adam, Honokaa, T. H.	333
Arakigi, Soheli, Honolulu, T. H.	336
Arruda, Manuel, Sr., Hilo, T. H.	332
Awong, William, Honokaa, T. H.	336
Barris, Charles, Honokaa, T. H.	339
Botelho, D., Haina, T. H.	335

Hawaiian Homes Commission, opponents to, telegrams—Continued	Page
Branco, Ralph, Honokaa, T. H.	337
Carvalho, Alexander, Hilo, T. H.	334
Carvalho, George, Haina, T. H.	333
Carvalho, James, Honokaa, T. H.	332
Cordeiro, Herman, Honokaa, T. H.	334
Correira, Dan, Honokaa, T. H.	333
Costa, George, Honokaa, T. H.	334
de Mello, Joseph, Hilo, T. H.	335
de Silva, Ben, Jr., Hilo, T. H.	333
Ferreira, William, Hamakaa, T. H.	333
Feliciano, Laur, Haina, T. H.	337
Fujii, Masao, Kopulena, T. H.	337
Fujino, Kazukoshi, T. H.	336
Furtado, David, Hilo, T. H.	335
Gomes, Raymond, Honokaa, T. H.	336
Gonsalves, Walter, Honokaa, T. H.	332
Higashi, T., Honokaa, T. H.	332
Hirako, K., Kamuela, T. H.	332
Hirata, Ruth, Honokaa, T. H.	334
Hart, William, Honokaa, T. H.	334
Ignacio, Amos, Haina, T. H.	335
Jenkins, C. L., Honokaa, T. H.	337
Johansen, D. L., Honokaa, T. H.	337
Kaneshiro, E. Y., Honokaa, T. H.	337
Kawabata, M., Kamuela, T. H.	337
Kitagawa, Isao, Haina, T. H.	332
Kotake, Janet, Honokaa, T. H.	335
Lawrence, Manuel, Haina, T. H.	334
Leon, Robert, Honokaa, T. H.	333
Marques, Joseph, Honokaa, T. H.	336
Matsuda, Douglas, Haina, T. H.	337
Matsunami, Masaru, Haina, T. H.	335
Medeiros, Joe, Honokaa, T. H.	334
Melvin, Souza, Hilo, T. H.	335
Mendes, Charles, Haina, T. H.	334
Menino, George, Hilo, T. H.	337
Miura, Hidetsura, Haina, T. H.	331
Moniz, Stanley, Honokaa, T. H.	338
Murakami, Kiyoshi, Honokaa, T. H.	336
Nakao, James, Honokaa, T. H.	337
Okura, M., Kamuela, T. H.	335
Olivai, G. R., Honokaa, T. H.	338
Oliveira, Tony, Hilo, T. H.	338
Onaga, Herbert, Honokaa, T. H.	336
Paiva, Charles, Honokaa, T. H.	332
Paresa, Walter, Haina, T. H.	332
Paulos, Fred, Hilo, T. H.	333
Perreira, John, Hilo, T. H.	333
Pestana, Joaquin, Honokaa, T. H.	332
Phillips, Tony, Hilo, T. H.	334
Ramos, Mary, Honokaa, T. H.	334
Rapoza, John, Hilo, T. H.	337
Sasaki, Masashi, Honokaa, T. H.	337
Serrao, Joseph, Hilo, T. H.	333
Shigematsu, Shoichi, Honokaa, T. H.	338
Shimobata, Wallace, Kalopa, T. H.	332
Silva, Albert, Honokaa, T. H.	332
Soares, Manuel, Honokaa, T. H.	336
Souza, James, Hilo, T. H.	334
Takae, Morio, Kukuiahaele, T. H.	335
Tamore, William, Honokaa, T. H.	337
Tanaka, Sadao, Honokaa, T. H.	337
Teves, John, Haina, T. H.	335
Texira, Ernest, Honokaa, T. H.	335
Thomatokaa, Adam, T. H.	332
Thompson, Kehaunani, Hawaii National Park, T. H.	336
Vincent, Boyd, Hilo, T. H.	333

Hawaiian Homes Commission, opponents to, telegrams—Continued	Page
Yahata, Taichi, Kopulena, T. H.-----	335
Yamada, Jennie, Hilo, T. H.-----	333
Yamamoto, Harris, Kopulena, T. H.-----	336
Yohsikani, S., Kamuela, T. H.-----	336
Hawaiian Organic Act, legislative action and references to congressional debates on-----	152
Hearings, congressional, on statehood for Hawaii, index of-----	305
Honolulu Star-Bulletin, 10 clippings, submitted by Senator Hugh Butler--	538
Incorporated Territories, obligation to grant statehood, legal memorandum re-----	96
Interior Department, official report on H. R. 49-----	27, 47
Judicial Conference Committee, amendments to H. R. 49 proposed by Hon. Albert B. Maris, United States circuit judge, United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, Philadelphia 7, Pa-----	102
Kurisaki, Harry I., memorandum submitted by Senator Hugh Butler, re--	522
Land ownership, Territory of Hawaii, June 30, 1948-----	461
Land use classification, summary of-----	460
Larade report to House Committee on Territories-----	19
McSweeney, John, United States Representative from the State of Ohio, news story re Hawaii-----	467
Maris, Hon. Albert B., amendments to H. R. 49, proposed by-----	102
Methodist Church, board of missions and church extension of, 140 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, N. Y.-----	532
National organizations adopting resolutions supporting statehood for Hawaii-----	119
National Party planks on statehood-----	116
Navy Department, official report on H. R. 49-----	32
Nixon, Richard M., United States Representative from the State of California, news release re Hawaii-----	466, 520
Obligation to grant statehood to Alaska and Hawaii, legal memorandum re-----	339
Organic act, legislative action re and references to congressional debates on-----	305
Pacific territories and island possessions, report by special committee, on H. R. 49-----	119
Payments, balance of, from Hawaii to mainland-----	436
Plebiscite, Hawaii, held November 5, 1940, results of-----	78
Population, comparison of number of Hawaiians, part-Hawaiians, and Caucasians, 1896-1950-----	91
Population, Hawaii compared to 13 States-----	456
Population of Hawaiian Islands at time of annexation-----	62
Population, Territory of Hawaii, July 1 1948 and July 1, 1949, civilian estimates-----	59
Public Health, California Department of, 668 Phelan Building, San Francisco 2, Calif-----	521
Public Lands Committee, House of Representatives, committee print of report of special committee on Pacific Territories and island possessions on H. R. 49-----	119
Public schools of Hawaii, statistical comparison with the 48 States, school year 1949 etc-----	218, 227
Revenues from public lands in Hawaii, fiscal years 1946 to 1948-----	461
School finance systems, elementary and secondary schools, Territorial support of public schools in Hawaii, revised January 1950, article on-----	74
State Department, official report on S. 156 and S. 1782-----	50, 51
Statehood for Hawaii as it affects the national interest-----	259
Territories, date of the establishment of a Territorial government in each, population and area-----	137
Territories of the United States at the date of their admission to the Union and comparison with Hawaii-----	455
Treaty of annexation of 1897, resolution of Hawaii Senate ratifying-----	16
Truman, Harry S., President of the United States, statements favoring statehood for Hawaii-----	114, 519
University of Hawaii, summary of statements of visiting professors as to why Hawaii should become a State-----	219
Veterans of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team, One Hundredth Infantry Battalion, Military Intelligence Service, and the One Thousand Three Hundred and Ninety-ninth Engineers, resolution of---	472
Voting, percentage of registrants, general elections-----	484

COMMUNICATIONS

	Page
American Civil Liberties Union, Patrick Murphy Malin, director, and Arthur Garfield Hays, general counsel, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.-----	527
American Legion, Arleigh J. Fonner, department commander, Department of Hawaii, post-office box 984, Hilo, T. H.-----	521
American Legion, Miles D. Kennedy, director, national legislative commission, 734 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C.-----	524
AMVETS, Marvin L. Goldberger, national legislative director, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.-----	525
Baptists of the United States, Joseph M. Dawson, executive director, joint conference committee on public relations, 1628 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C.-----	531
Catholic War Veterans, Thomas H. Spiegel, adjutant, Monroe County Chapter 30 Reed Park, Rochester, 5, N. Y.-----	525
Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, Clarence R. Miles, manager, department of governmental affairs, Washington 6, D. C.-----	528
Coke, James L., former chief justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii.-----	122-125
Condie, Malcolm, international board member, district 22, United Mine Workers of America, Rock Springs, Wyo.-----	534
Council for social action of the Congregational Christian Churches of the United States of America, Thomas B. Keehn, legislative secretary, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.-----	532
Crittenden, Harold C., principal, Armonk School, Armonk, N. Y.-----	536
Cruzen, Bob, managing editor, Laramie Republican Boomerang, Laramie, Wyo.-----	533
Defense Department, official report on H. R. 49.-----	52
Department of Public Health, State of California, Wilton L. Halverson, M. D., director of public health, 668 Phelan Building, San Francisco 2, Calif.-----	521
Disabled American Veterans, Francis M. Sullivan, national legislative director, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C.-----	526
Federal Reserve System, official report on H. R. 49.-----	52
Guam, re statehood for, from Hon. Carlton Skinner, Governor of Guam.-----	287
Hawaii Club, University of, Hukio Naito, president, Ann Arbor, Mich.-----	524
Honolulu Council of Churches, Harold W. Kent, president, Bishop Museum Ground, Honolulu 17, T. H.-----	521
Hoopale, John A., Holualoa Beach, Territory of Hawaii.-----	495
Hoyt, Palmer, publisher, the Denver Post, Denver, Colo.-----	533
Interior Department, official report on H. R. 49.-----	27, 47
International Association for Identification, Leroy Goodwin, secretary and treasurer, 1047 Hawthorne Street, Youngstown 2, Ohio.-----	527
International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, William Glazier, Washington representative, 930 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C.-----	530
Lee, J. Bracken, Governor of the State of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.---	520
Lewis, Edward R., 1138 Hamptondale Road, Winnetka, Ill.-----	492
Lions International, Melvin Jones, secretary general, 332 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago 4, Ill.-----	529
Mana School students, letter from.-----	473
Mantel, Kenneth H., 999 President Street, Brooklyn 25, N. Y.-----	534
National Association of Attorneys General, Alan Bible, president, Carson City, Nev.-----	620
National Association of Real Estate Boards, Herbert U. Nelson, executive vice president, 1737 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.-----	528
National Association of Sanitarians, Roscoe C. Davis, executive secretary, Los Angeles, Calif.-----	528
National Education Association of the United States, Willard E. Givens, executive secretary, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.---	529
Nixon, Richard, United States Representative from the State of California.-----	520
Railway Labor Executives' Association, A. E. Lyon, executive secretary, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C.-----	531
Riverton Times, Riverton, Wyo.-----	534
Ritchie, William, 824-837 First National Bank Building, Omaha 2, Nebr.---	536

	Page
State Department, official report on S. 156 and S. 1782-----	50, 51
Sullivan, J. R., Laramie, Wyo-----	534
Truman, Harry S., President of the United States-----	114, 579
Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Omar B. Ketchum, director, Defense Building, Washington 6, D. C-----	491, 526
Wilson, John H., mayor, city of Honolulu, Honolulu, T. H-----	521
Women's Division of Christian Service of the board of missions and church extension of the Methodist Church, Eleanor Neff, associate secretary, 140 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, N. Y-----	532
Young Men's Christian Association of Honolulu, Henry G. Ellis, general secretary, Post Office Box 459, Honolulu 9, Hawaii-----	522
Young Women's Christian Association of the United States of America, Mrs. Arthur Forrest Anderson, chairman, national board, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York 22, N. Y-----	533
Zonta International, Mrs. Harold St. John, secretary, 2365 Hoomaha Way, Honolulu 14, T. H-----	522

HAWAII STATEHOOD

MONDAY, MAY 1, 1950

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:25 a. m., in the caucus room, Senate Office Building, Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney of Wyoming (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Wyoming (chairman); Clinton P. Anderson, New Mexico; Glen H. Taylor, Idaho; Hugh Butler, Nebraska; Guy Cordon, Oregon; and Zales N. Ecton, Montana.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please come to order. There are before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs several bills to provide statehood for the Territory of Hawaii. One of these bills, S. 156, was introduced in the Senate on January 5, 1949, by Senator Knowland of California for himself and Senator Cordon of this committee.

Another, S. 1782, was introduced on May 5, 1949, by Senator Kefauver of Tennessee. The third measure which is before us and which will be made part of the record is H. R. 49 introduced in the House and passed by the House on March 7, 1950. Hearings were held in the House and of course a favorable report was filed.

The bill itself and the report will be made part of the record.

(H. R. 49, S. 156, and S. 1782, along with report on H. R. 49 are as follows:)

[H. R. 49, 81st Cong., 2d sess.]

AN ACT To enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the inhabitants of all that part of the area of the United States now constituting the Territory of Hawaii, as at present described, may become the State of Hawaii, as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. That all citizens of the United States who have the qualifications for voters for representatives to the Territorial legislature are hereby authorized to vote for and choose delegates to form a convention in said Territory.

Such delegates shall possess the qualifications of such electors, and members of the Territorial legislature shall be eligible to election as such delegates, and with no resulting disqualification as such members of the Territorial legislature the provisions of sections 16 and 17 of the Hawaiian Organic Act to the contrary notwithstanding.

The aforesaid convention shall consist of sixty-three delegates apportioned among the counties and city and county, and the representative districts within the limits of the proposed State on the following basis:

County of Hawaii, at large, four delegates;

First representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7; precincts 8, 9, 10, and 11; precincts 12, 13, and 14; precincts 15, 16, 30, and 17; precincts 18, 19, 20, 21, 31, and 22; precincts 23, 32, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29;

Second representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 16; precincts 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15.

County of Maui, at large, three delegates;

Third representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5; precincts 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11; precincts 9, 12, 13, and 28; precincts 14, 15, 16, and 17; precincts 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27; precincts 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34;

City and county of Honolulu hereinafter included in the word "county," at large, twelve delegates;

Fourth representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 24, 25, and 26; precincts 19, 20, 21, and 22; precincts 15 and 16; precincts 12, 17, and 32; precincts 11 and 18; precincts 13 and 14; precincts 6 and 36; precincts 7 and 8; precincts 9 and 10; precincts 34 and 31; precincts 5 and 35; precincts 4, 30, and 33; precincts 1 and 2; precincts 3 and 29;

Fifth representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 5, 7, 30, and 31; precincts 6, 29, 8, and 9; precincts 10, 11, 32, and 26; precincts 12, 33, and 13; precincts 14, 15, 16, and 17; precincts 18 and 19; precincts 22, 23, 28, and 27;

Fourth and fifth representative districts, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 28, fourth district, and precincts 1, 2, 3, and 4, fifth district; precinct 27, fourth district, and precincts 20 and 21, fifth district; precinct 23, fourth district, and precincts 24 and 25, fifth district;

County of Kauai, at large, two delegates;

Sixth representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 1, 2, 3, and 4; precincts 5 and 6; precincts 8, 9, 10, and 11; and one delegate from precinct 7.

The precincts herein mentioned are as they existed on November 5, 1946.

The Governor of said Territory shall, within thirty days after the approval of this Act, issue a proclamation ordering a primary election for the nomination of candidates for the offices of the delegates aforesaid on a day designated by him in said proclamation, not earlier than sixty nor later than ninety days after the approval of this Act; and a final election not earlier than thirty, nor later than forty, days after such primary election.

The name of no candidate shall be printed upon any official ballot to be used at such primary election unless at least twenty days prior to such primary a nomination paper shall have been filed in the office of the secretary of the Territory in his behalf, nominating him as a candidate for delegate from the county concerned, or from a precinct or combination of precincts in a representative district or districts, as may be the case, and signed by not less than twenty-five qualified electors of the district concerned, and the sum of \$25 shall have been paid to the secretary of the Territory, which fee shall be a Territorial realization.

Each person shall be a qualified elector of the county or precinct or combination of precincts in which he is a candidate for delegate.

No such nomination paper shall contain any reference to or designation of any political party, and the ballots used at such election shall be nonpartisan and shall not contain any reference to or designation of the political party or affiliation of any candidate. The names of the candidates in each county and of the candidates in the precinct or combination of precincts of the representative districts shall be on separate ballots.

The ballots submitted to the voters of each county, precinct, or combination of precincts shall separately set forth the names of candidates for delegates from such county or precinct or combinations of precincts, and shall instruct the voters that the number of candidates to be voted for by such voter shall not exceed the number of delegates to which the county, precinct, or combination of precincts is entitled, or the number of such delegates remaining to be elected, as the case may be, which number shall be stated. The ballots in each county shall also instruct the voters that the number of candidates to be voted for by each voter shall not be less than a majority of the number of delegates which such county is entitled to elect at the particular election, primary or final, as the case may be, and the number constituting such a majority shall be stated. At such primary election any candidate in a precinct or combination of precincts who receives a majority of the votes of the voters voting therein shall be declared elected, and any candidate in a county who receives such a majority of votes, not exceeding the number of delegates to be elected from each county, shall likewise be declared elected. The names of the remaining candidates receiving the highest number of votes, not exceeding two from each precinct or combination of precincts, or double the number of delegates to be elected at large from each county

above the number already declared elected as aforesaid, if any, shall be placed on the ballot for the final election.

No ballot in a county ticket shall be counted at either the primary election or the final election unless the number of candidates voted for by the voter is at least equal to a majority of the number of delegates which the county concerned was entitled to elect at such election.

Only those nominated at such primary election shall be eligible to run for delegate at such final election. The ballots for such final election shall be in substantially the same form as those for the primary election, and the requirements of this Act as to such primary election shall, as far as appropriate, apply to such final election. In case of a tie vote at either the primary or final election, the candidates so tied shall draw lots under the supervision of the county clerk to determine which of them shall be nominated or elected as the case may be.

In case any office of delegate has not been filled or shall become vacant for any reason the Governor shall appoint an elector of the same county, precinct, or combination of precincts, to fill such vacancy.

Except as otherwise specifically provided by this Act, the primary and final elections for such delegates shall be conducted, the returns made, the results ascertained, and the certificates of persons elected to such convention issued in the same manner as is prescribed by the laws of said Territory regulating elections therein of members of the legislature. The convention shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of the delegates.

Sec. 3. That the delegates to the convention thus elected shall meet at the seat of government of said Territory on the second Tuesday after their election, excluding the day of election in case such day shall be Tuesday, and, after organization, shall declare on behalf of the people of said proposed State that they adopt the Constitution of the United States, whereupon the said convention shall be, and is hereby, authorized to form a constitution and State government for said proposed State.

The constitution shall be republican in form and make no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race, color, or sex, and not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence. And said convention shall provide in said constitution:

First. That perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship.

Second. That provisions shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools, which shall be open to all the children of said State and free from sectarian control.

Third. That the debts and liabilities of said Territory of Hawaii shall be assumed and paid by said State.

Fourth. That the property in the Territory of Hawaii set aside by Executive order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union is ceded to the United States, as more particularly provided in the next section of this Act.

Fifth. That authority is granted to and acknowledged in the United States to the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation, as provided by article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States, in all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land as are now owned by the United States and held for military, naval, or coast-guard purposes, whether title to such lands was acquired by cession and transfer to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii and set aside by Executive order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States, or acquired by the United States by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided*, That the State of Hawaii shall have the right to serve civil or criminal process within the aid tracts or parcels of land in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed within the said State but outside of the said tracts or parcels of land; and the Legislative Assembly is authorized and directed to enact any law necessary or proper to give effect to this article.

Sixth. That, as a compact with the United States relating to the management and disposition of the Hawaiian home lands, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is adopted as a law of said State, subject to amendment or repeal only with the consent of the United States, and in no other manner: *Provided*, That (1) sections 202, 213, 219, 220, 222, 224, and 225 and other provisions relating to administration, and paragraph (2) of section 204, sections 206 and 212, and other provisions relating to the powers and duties of officers other

than those charged with the administration of said Act, may be amended in the original constitution or in the manner required for ordinary State legislation, but the Hawaiian home-loan fund and the Hawaiian home-development fund shall not be reduced or impaired, and the encumbrances authorized to be placed on Hawaiian home lands by officers other than those charged with the administration of said Act shall not be increased, except with the consent of the United States; (2) that any amendment to increase the benefits to lessees of Hawaiian home lands may be made in the original constitution or in the manner required for ordinary State legislation but the qualifications of lessees shall not be changed except with the consent of the United States; and (3) that all proceeds and income from Hawaiian home lands, shall be available to said State for use in accordance with the terms of said Act.

Seventh. That the lands and other property belonging to citizens of the United States residing without said State shall never be taxed at a higher rate than the lands and other property belonging to residents thereof.

SEC. 4. (a) The State of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, shall retain all the lands and other public property title to which is in the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof, except as herein provided, and all such lands and other property shall remain and be the absolute property of the State of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, subject to the constitution and laws of said State: *Provided, however*, That any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by Executive order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, shall be and become the property of the United States absolutely or subject to such limitations, as the case may be.

(b) The United States shall retain title to all the public lands and other public property (except as hereafter provided) for a period of five years after the enactment of this Act. Such land and public property shall continue to be administered in accordance with the laws applicable thereto immediately prior to the admission of said State until otherwise provided by the Congress: *Provided*, That immediately after the enactment of this Act an investigation and report shall be made by a joint committee composed of the members of the Committees on Public Lands of the Senate and of the House of Representatives upon the subject of public lands and other property in Hawaii, and the Congress shall thereafter make a final determination and disposition of the remaining public lands and other public property. In the event the Congress has made no other disposition thereof within said five-year period, then title to all of the public lands and other public property undisposed of shall thereupon vest in the State of Hawaii absolutely: *Provided, however*, That any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by Executive order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States or the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, shall be and become the property of the United States or the State of Hawaii or of such political subdivision, as the case may be, absolutely or subject to such limitations, as the case may be.

(c) The State of Hawaii, upon its admission to the Union, shall be entitled to select, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue patents to said State for, one hundred and eighty thousand acres of public lands, as that term is defined in section 73 (a) of the Hawaiian Organic Act (42 Stat. 116, 48 U. S. C., sec. 663), within the boundaries of said State. The selection of such lands by the State of Hawaii shall be made and completed within five years from the admission of said State into the Union. The lands so selected shall be in lieu of any and all grants provided for new States by provisions of law other than this Act, and such grants shall not extend to the State of Hawaii.

(d) The lands patented to the State of Hawaii pursuant to the preceding subsection, together with the proceeds thereof and the income therefrom, shall be held by said State as a public trust for the support of the public schools and other public educational institutions, for the betterment of the conditions of native Hawaiians, as defined in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, for the development of farm and home ownership on as widespread a basis as possible, and for the making of public improvements. Such lands, proceeds, and income shall be managed and disposed of for one or more of the foregoing purposes in such manner as the constitution and laws of said State may provide, and their use for any other object shall constitute a breach of trust for which

suit may be brought by the United States. The schools and other educational institutions supported, in whole or in part, out of such public trust shall forever remain under the exclusive control of said State; and no part of the proceeds or income from the lands patented under the preceding subsection shall be used for the support of any sectarian school, college, or university.

(e) Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union all laws of the United States reserving to the United States the free use or enjoyment of property hereinabove vested in the State of Hawaii or its political subdivisions, or the right to alter, amend, or repeal laws relating thereto, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. That when said constitution shall be formed as aforesaid, the convention forming the same shall provide for the submission of said constitution, together with the ordinances of said convention requiring ratification, to the people of said Territory for ratification at an election which shall be held on a day named by said convention not earlier than sixty nor later than ninety days after said convention adjourns, at which election the qualified voters of said Territory shall vote directly for or against said constitution, for or against any provisions thereof separately submitted, and for or against said ordinances. Persons possessing the qualifications entitling them to vote for delegate under this Act shall be entitled to vote on the ratification or rejection of said constitution, the provisions thereof separately submitted, and said ordinances, under such rules or regulations as said convention may have prescribed, not in conflict with this Act. The returns of said election shall be made by the election officers direct to the secretary of said Territory who, with the Governor and the chief justice of said Territory, shall constitute a canvassing board and they, or any two of them, shall meet at the city of Honolulu, on the third Monday after said election, and shall canvass the same.

The said canvassing board shall forthwith certify the result of said election to the Governor of said Territory, together with a statement of the votes cast upon the question of ratification or rejection of said constitution, also a statement of the votes cast for or against such provisions thereof as were separately submitted to the voters at said election, and for or against said ordinances. If a majority of the legal votes cast at said election shall reject the constitution, the Governor of said Territory shall, by proclamation, order the constitutional convention to reassemble at a date not later than twenty days after the receipt by said Governor of the documents showing the rejection of the constitution by the people, and thereafter a new constitution shall be framed and the same proceedings shall be taken in regard thereto in like manner as if said constitution were being originally prepared for submission and submitted to the people.

When said constitution shall have been duly ratified by the people of said Territory, as aforesaid, a certified copy of the same, together with such provisions thereof as have been separately submitted and duly ratified, and such ordinances of the convention as have been duly ratified, shall be submitted to the President of the United States for approval, together with a statement of the votes cast upon said constitution, and upon any provisions thereof separately submitted, and upon said ordinances. And if the constitution of said proposed State is republican in form and makes no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race, color, or sex, and is not repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and if all of the provisions of this Act relating to the formation of said constitution and State government have been complied with, it shall be the duty of the President of the United States thereupon to approve said constitution, and the said separate provisions thereof and ordinances, and to certify his approval to the Governor of said Territory. Within thirty days after the receipt of said notification from the President of the United States, the Governor shall issue his proclamation for the election, as hereinafter provided, of officers for all elective offices provided for by the constitution and laws of said State, except those offices for which the constitutional convention, by ordinance duly ratified by the people, shall have made other temporary provisions, but the officers so to be elected shall in any event include two Senators and two Representatives in Congress. Until and unless otherwise required by ordinance of said convention duly ratified by the people, or by the constitution or laws of said State, said Representatives shall be elected at large: *Provided*, That if the President of the United States shall approve said constitution but shall disapprove any provision thereof separately voted upon by the people, or any ordinance of said convention, the same shall be certified to the Governor of said Territory, and said election shall be held and all further proceedings for the admission of said new State shall be the same as if the provisions and ordinances

so disapproved had been rejected by the people. And if the President shall disapprove said constitution, such disapproval shall be certified to the Governor of said Territory, with the President's objections to the proposed constitution; the Governor thereupon by proclamation shall order the constitutional convention to reassemble at a date not later than twenty days after receipt of such notification and thereafter a new constitution shall be framed and the same proceedings shall be taken in regard thereto in like manner as if said constitution were being originally prepared for submission and submitted to the people.

SEC. 6. That said constitutional convention shall provide that in case of the ratification of said constitution by the people, and in case the President of the United States approves the same, all as hereinbefore provided, an election, or primary and general elections, as may be required, shall be held at the time or times named in the proclamation of the Governor of said Territory provided for in the preceding section. Said election shall take place not earlier than sixty days nor later than ninety days after said proclamation by the Governor of said Territory ordering the same, or if a primary election is to be held, then the primary election shall take place not earlier than sixty days nor later than ninety days after said proclamation by the Governor of said Territory, and the general election shall take place within forty days after the primary election. At such election or elections the officers required to be elected as provided in section 5, shall be chosen by the people. Such election or elections shall be held, and the qualifications of voters thereat shall be, as prescribed by said constitution and the laws of said State for the election of members of the State legislature, except as otherwise provided by ordinance of said constitutional convention duly ratified by the people. The returns thereof shall be made, canvassed, and certified in the same manner as in this Act prescribed with respect to the election for the ratification or rejection of said constitution, as hereinbefore provided. When said election of said officers above provided for shall be held and the returns thereof made, canvassed, and certified as hereinbefore provided, the Governor of the said Territory shall certify the result of said election, as canvassed and certified as herein provided, to the President of the United States, who thereupon shall immediately issue his proclamation announcing the result of said election so ascertained, and, upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States, the proposed State of Hawaii shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union by virtue of this Act, on an equal footing with the other States. Until the said State is so admitted into the Union, the persons holding legislative, executive, and judicial offices in or under or by authority of the government of said Territory, and the Delegate in Congress thereof, shall continue to discharge the duties of their respective offices. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States and the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the officers elected at said election, and qualified under the provisions of the constitution and laws of said State, shall proceed to exercise all the functions pertaining to their offices in or under or by authority of the government of said State, and officers not required to be elected at said initial election shall be selected or continued in office as provided by ordinances of the constitutional convention duly ratified by the people, or by the constitution and laws of said State. The Governor and secretary of said State shall certify the election of the Senators and Representatives in the manner required by law, and the said Senators and Representatives shall be entitled to be admitted to seats in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of other States in the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 7. Upon the admission of the proposed State into the Union the House of Representatives shall be composed of two additional Members until the expiration of the Eighty-second Congress.

Subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for apportioning Representatives in Congress among the several States by the equal proportions method", approved November 15, 1941 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, Supp. V, title 2, sec. 2b), is hereby amended, effective on the date of the admission of the proposed State of Hawaii into the Union, to read as follows:

“(a) Each State (other than Hawaii) shall be entitled, in the Seventy-eighth and in each Congress thereafter until the taking effect of a reapportionment under a subsequent statute or such section 22, as amended by this Act, to the number of Representatives shown in the statement transmitted to the Congress on January 8, 1941, based upon the method known as the method of equal proportions, no State to receive less than one Member; and the State of Hawaii shall be entitled to two Representatives from the time of its admission into the Union until the taking effect of such a reapportionment.”

SEC. 8. That the sum of \$200,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for defraying the expenses of the elections provided for in this Act and the expenses of the convention and for the payment of compensation to the delegates to said convention. The delegates shall receive for their services, in addition to mileage at the rate of 20 cents a mile each way, the sum of \$1,000 each, payable in four equal installments on and after the first, twentieth, fortieth, and sixtieth days of the convention, excluding Sundays and holidays. The disbursements of the money so appropriated shall be made by the Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii. The Territorial legislature is hereby authorized to appropriate such sum as it may deem advisable for the payment of additional compensation to said delegates and for defraying their expenses and for such other purposes as it may deem necessary.

SEC. 9. That the State of Hawaii shall constitute a judicial district within the ninth judicial circuit, to be known as the district of Hawaii. To the United States district court hereby created two judges shall be appointed, and to it and to them all laws relating to United States district courts and district judges shall be applicable. The regular terms of the court shall be held at Honolulu on the second Monday in April and October, and the office of clerk of court shall be kept at Honolulu.

SEC. 10. That the district of Hawaii shall include, in addition to the State of Hawaii, the places named in title 28, United States Code, section 91.

SEC. 11. That in the manner prescribed by law there shall be appointed a clerk for the district court, a United States attorney, a United States marshal for the district and such assistants, deputies, court officers, and clerical and other personnel as are provided for by the laws relating to district courts, judges, and judicial districts.

SEC. 12. No action, case, proceeding, or matter pending in any court of the Territory of Hawaii, or in the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii, shall abate by reason of the admission of said State into the Union, but the same shall be transferred to and proceeded with in such appropriate State courts as shall be established under the constitution to be thus formed, or in the District Court of the United States for the District of Hawaii, as the nature of the case may require. And no indictment, action, or proceedings shall abate by reason of any change in the courts, but shall be proceeded with in the State or United States courts according to the laws thereof, respectively. And the appropriate State courts and the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii shall be the successors of the courts of the Territory and the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii as to all cases arising within the limits embraced within the jurisdiction of such courts, respectively, with full power to proceed with the same, and award mesne or final process therein, and all the files, records, indictments, and proceedings relating to any such cases shall be transferred to such appropriate State courts and the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, respectively, and the same shall be proceeded with therein in due course of law.

All civil causes of action and all criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed prior to the admission of said State, but as to which no suit, action, or prosecution shall be pending at the date of such admission, shall be subject to prosecution in the appropriate State courts or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii in like manner, to the same extent, and with like right of appellate review, as if said State had been created and said courts had been established prior to the accrual of such causes of action or the commission of such offenses; and such of said criminal offenses as shall have been committed against the laws of the Territory shall be tried and punished by the appropriate courts of said State, and such as shall have been committed against the laws of the United States shall be tried and punished in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii.

SEC. 13. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of final decisions of the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii or the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii in any case finally decided prior to admission of said State into the Union, whether or not an appeal therefrom shall have been perfected prior to such admission, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided prior to admission of said State into the Union, and any mandate issued subsequent to the admission of said State shall be to the District Court of the United States for the District of Hawaii or a court of the State, as may be appropriate. Parties shall have

the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of all judgments and decrees of the District Court of the United States for the District of Hawaii as successor to the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii, and of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawaii as successor to the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, in any case pending at the time of admission of said State into the Union, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided in any case arising subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union.

SEC. 14. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) title 28, United States Code, section 1252, is amended by excluding Hawaii from the application of the clause relating to courts of record;

(b) title 28, United States Code, section 1293, is amended by striking out the words "First and Ninth Circuits" and by inserting in lieu thereof "First Circuit", and by striking out the words "Supreme courts of Puerto Rico and Hawaii, respectively" and inserting in lieu thereof "Supreme court of Puerto Rico";

(c) title 28, United States Code, section 1294, is amended by striking out paragraph (5) thereof and by renumbering paragraph (6) as paragraph (5);

(d) title 28, section 373, insofar as it relates to any justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Hawaii, shall be null and void; and

(e) title 48, section 634 (a) shall be null and void.

SEC. 15. All laws in force in the Territory of Hawaii at the time of its admission into the Union shall continue in force in the State of Hawaii, except as modified or changed by this Act or by the constitution of the State or by ordinance of the constitutional convention duly ratified by the people, and shall be subject to repeal or amendment by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, except as hereinbefore provided with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended; and the laws of the United States shall have the same force and effect within the said State as elsewhere within the United States.

SEC. 16. Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall continue to have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over the area which may then or thereafter be included in Hawaii National Park, saving, however, to the State of Hawaii the same rights as are reserved to the Territory of Hawaii by section 1 of the Act of April 19, 1930 (46 Stat. 227), and saving, further, to persons then or thereafter residing within such area the right to vote at all elections held within the political subdivisions where they respectively reside. Upon the admission of said State all reference to the Territory of Hawaii in said Act or in other laws relating to Hawaii National Park shall be deemed to refer to the State of Hawaii. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to affect the ownership and control by the United States of any lands or other property within Hawaii National Park which may now belong to, or which may hereafter be acquired by, the United States.

SEC. 17. All Acts or parts of Acts in conflict with the provisions of this Act, whether passed by the legislature of said Territory or by Congress, are hereby repealed.

Passed the House of Representatives March 7, 1950.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS, *Clerk*.

[H. Rept. No. 254, 81st Cong., 1st sess.]

The Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 21, line 25, and page 22, lines 1 to 4, strike out the language of section 10 and insert in lieu thereof: "That the district of Hawaii shall include, in addition to the State of Hawaii, the places named in title 28, United States Code, section 91."

Page 25, lines 1 to 6, strike out the language of section 14 and insert in lieu thereof:

"Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

"(a) title 28, United States Code, section 1252, is amended by excluding Hawaii from the application of the clause relating to courts of record;

"(b) title 28, United States Code, section 1293, is amended by striking out the words 'First and Ninth Circuits' and by inserting in lieu thereof 'First Circuit,' and by striking out the words 'Supreme courts of Puerto Rico and Hawaii, respectively' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Supreme Court of Puerto Rico'; and

"(c) title 28, United States Code, section 1294, is amended by striking out paragraph (5) thereof and by renumbering paragraph (6) as paragraph (5)."

Page 26, line 5, add the following sentence:

"Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to affect the ownership and control by the United States of any lands or other property within Hawaii National Park which may now belong to, or which may hereafter be acquired by, the United States."

PURPOSE OF H. R. 49

The purpose of H. R. 49 is to create the political machinery whereby the Territory of Hawaii may become the forty-ninth State of the United States, by—

1. Authorizing a State constitutional convention to be held in the Territory;
 2. Outlining the manner of election of delegates to such convention;
 3. Establishing qualifications for voting for delegates to the convention;
 4. Providing the manner for adoption of a State constitution;
 5. Outlining special requirements to be included in the constitution, particularly with reference to making distribution of public lands;
 6. Providing a method of ratification of the constitution;
 7. Requiring approval of the constitution by the President of the United States;
 8. Providing for representation in the Congress of the United States;
 9. Authorizing the expenses of the constitution and the elections to be held pursuant thereto;
 10. Establishing the State of Hawaii as a judicial district within the ninth judicial circuit;
 11. Establishing jurisdiction of the United States district court for the district;
 12. Authorizing appointment of court officials, et cetera;
 13. Providing for the extension of existing laws of the Territory of Hawaii after its admission as a State;
 14. Retaining jurisdiction in the United States over military, naval, and Coast Guard property, Hawaii National Park, and other lands; and
 15. Repealing existing laws in conflict with this bill.
- (See analysis of H. R. 49, appendix 1.)

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Hawaiian Islands, a semitropic archipelago in the North Pacific Ocean, are composed of a series of islands stretching over 1,910 statute miles. Approximately the size in land area of Connecticut and Rhode Island combined, the eight main islands, which are situated within a distance of about 350 miles of each other, are populated by more than one-half a million people.

Agriculture is the principal industry on the islands, with sugarcane and pineapples as the chief crops. The islands produce approximately 90 percent of all pineapples grown in the world.

The next largest industry consists of the tourist trade, for Hawaii's climate and scenery have much to offer the vacationer. Stock farming follows as the next most predominant industry in the islands.

First introduced to the world in 1778 by Capt. James Cook of the British Navy, Hawaii's modern era began in 1820 with the arrival of 17 New England missionaries. Before many years had passed, the natives were converted to Christianity and made familiar with the ways of the West.

By 1842, five out of six ships calling at Hawaii were American, and United States cultural influence, despite strong British competition, rapidly assumed predominance. When it became apparent that other nations were seriously developing covetous ideas relative to the islands, Washington announced that the United States would look with distinct disfavor upon the attempt of another power to annex the Hawaiian Islands.

The British took control of the government of Hawaii for about 5 months in 1843 and the French occupied Honolulu for about 10 days in 1849. After these incidents, sentiment for acquiring the islands swept America and the Congress. (It seems pertinent to comment at this point that if our predecessors believed Hawaii should be considered a United States Territory when travel to it from

the mainland required weeks, there is no reason today for arguing that statehood for a geographically distant area is unfeasible. By plane, Hawaii is only hours away from the continental United States.)

Traditionally a kingdom, Hawaii became a republic in 1894. In this decisive step, the Hawaiians followed the same governmental pattern as that of the United States, i. e., three primary branches of government—the executive, the legislative, and the judiciary.

When William McKinley became President of the United States in 1896, he made it clear that he would not be deaf to the pleas of the infant Hawaiian government that the United States acquire possession of the islands. At that time he wrote, "We need Hawaii just as much and a great deal more than we did California. It is manifest destiny."

In 1897, Hawaii again offered to exchange her independent sovereignty for the ultimate objective of the sovereignty of statehood. Annexation as a part of the United States was accomplished, on the part of the Republic of Hawaii, by ratification by its senate on September 9, 1897, of a treaty accomplished in Washington on June 16, 1897, which stated:

"The Republic of Hawaii and the United States of America, in view of the natural dependence of the Hawaiian Islands upon the United States, of their geographical proximity thereto, of the preponderant share acquired by the United States and its citizens in the industries and trade of said islands, and of the expressed desire of the Government of the Republic of Hawaii that those islands should be incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof, and under its sovereignty, have determined to accomplish by treaty an object so important to their mutual and permanent welfare."

The foregoing resolution of the Senate of the Republic of Hawaii in its entirety is made a part of this report in appendix 2.

Annexation on the part of the United States was accomplished by Senate Joint Resolution 55, known as the Newlands resolution, on July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750). The Newlands resolution is made a part of this report in appendix 3.

The resolutions annexing the Republic of Hawaii as a "part of the territory of the United States" and the Republic of Texas as a State, are the only examples of annexation of territory by joint resolution. In both instances, they were independently sovereign nations, voluntarily surrendering that independent sovereignty.

The Newlands resolution provided for the appointment by the President of a board of five commissioners to recommend a form of government to the Congress, thus contemplating an organic act, which was enacted on April 30, 1900 (31 Stat. L. 141, c. 39). Hawaii thus became an incorporated, organized Territory of the United States, the organic act serving as its constitution. By this act, Hawaii resembles in every material respect the Territories which were created in the continental United States as a preliminary to statehood, the first of which was organized by the Northwest Ordinance of 1787.

The Northwest Ordinance established the principle that the ultimate destiny of a Territory of the United States is statehood. It has been through no lack of effort on the part of the residents of the Hawaiian Islands that they have not yet achieved their goal.

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

Since 1903, either by petition or resolution of the Territorial legislature, the desire for statehood has been brought to the attention of Congress on 15 different occasions. Beginning with H. R. 12210 introduced in the Sixty-sixth Congress, second session, on February 2, 1920, and continuing through the Eightieth Congress, no less than 28 different bills have been introduced in Congress granting statehood to Hawaii. In the Eighty-first Congress one bill has been introduced in the Senate and seven bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives to effect statehood for Hawaii.

Investigations leading to serious consideration of the aspiration of Hawaii to attain statehood have been made by Congress over a long period of years. Since 1935, five congressional committees have investigated the subject of statehood for Hawaii. Of the seven separate hearings on this legislation, four have been held in the Territory. During this time, 31 Members of Congress have visited the islands for these investigations. Testimony from more than 600 witnesses has been taken and a record comprising nearly 3,000 pages has been compiled. Of those testifying, approximately 500 were in favor of immediate statehood for Hawaii. In the hearings held in Washington during the Eightieth

Congress to determine national sentiment, 43 witnesses testified for statehood and none appeared in opposition.

This entire record is available for examination. The record on Hawaii is complete. Virtually everything there is to know about Hawaii has been chronicled in these volumes. Her social, political, cultural, and economic structure has been subjected to an examination that was unheard of when the other 29 Territories were candidates for statehood.

The first investigation of statehood took place in Hawaii during the Seventy-fourth Congress in 1935. This committee reported that it "found the Territory of Hawaii to be a modern unit of the American commonwealth with a political, social, and economic structure of the highest type," and recommended further study. Two years later, a joint committee of the House and Senate investigated statehood. Nineteen members of the committee visited the major islands of Hawaii and held hearings for 17 days. A thorough examination of the Territory's social, political, economic, and cultural life was made. A volume of testimony and exhibits covering every facet of the Territory was compiled. Though in its report the committee stated, "Hawaii has fulfilled every requirement for statehood heretofore exacted for Territories," the committee felt that further action should be deferred due to the disturbed conditions of international affairs.

During the war years which followed, Hawaii held its statehood aspirations in abeyance, although an official plebiscite in the Territory in 1940 showed the citizens of Hawaii to be in favor of statehood by an overwhelming majority.

Congressional hearings were resumed in Hawaii in January 1946. The exhibits, charts, tables, and statements collected in great detail in 1937 were brought up to date in the voluminous text of the investigation made by the House Subcommittee on Territories under the chairmanship of Hon. Henry D. Larcade, Jr., of Louisiana. This committee in its report recommended that since:

"1. The people of the Territory of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question not only their loyalty and patriotism but also their desire to assume the responsibilities of statehood; and since

"2. The policy of the United States Government is one of self-determination that peoples be allowed to choose freely their form of political status; and since

"3. Hawaii's strategic location in the Pacific plays so large a part in our country's international position in this area; and since

"4. The Congress of the United States has through a series of acts and committee reports indicated to the people of the Territory that Hawaii would be admitted into the Union when qualified; and since

"5. The Territory of Hawaii now meets the necessary requirements for statehood:

"It is the recommendation of this subcommittee that the Committee on Territories give immediate consideration to legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood."

The report of the Larcade subcommittee is included in its entirety in this report as appendix 4.

The Seventy-ninth Congress adjourned without further action being taken. But in the Eightieth Congress statehood legislation was again introduced, and hearings before the Committee of Public Lands were held, not to duplicate the vast amount of material already part of the official Congressional Record of Hawaii's readiness for statehood, but to determine the National and State-side sentiment reflected from the National Capital.

The bill now under consideration, H. R. 49, introduced by Delegate Joseph R. Farrington, of Hawaii, is identical, except for minor clarifying amendments, with that passed on June 30, 1947, by the House during the Eightieth Congress. During the 7 days of hearings before the House Public Lands Committee in March of that year, statements in support of statehood were made for the record by many nationally prominent leaders, including Secretary of the Interior Julius A. Krug; Fleet Admiral Chester A. Nimitz, commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet during World War II; and Maj. Gen. Charles D. Herron (retired), former commander of the Hawaii Department, United States Army.

Secretary Krug stated in part that, in his opinion, "the granting of statehood to Hawaii is in harmony with the traditions of American Government; further postponement is a repudiation of our principles and traditions as embodied in the great organic documents on which this Nation was founded—the Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution.

Secretary Krug also testified that "General MacArthur had expressed the opinion favoring statehood for Hawaii on the premise that such a policy would definitely support his efforts in democratizing Japan and other areas of the Orient and would assist in overcoming the inroads of nondemocratic forms of government."

Admiral Nimitz, testifying as a private citizen, said he had great admiration and appreciation of the complete and wholehearted cooperation the people of Hawaii gave to the war effort, and that from a military and naval standpoint he saw no objection to the islands achieving statehood.

Thirty-five witnesses were heard, none opposing the legislation. The committee in its report emphasized the following facts and conclusions:

1. That Hawaii has had a written constitution since 1840 which attests to the influence of American constitutional concepts upon its development;

2. That Hawaii has had an expressed desire to become a State of the Union since 1854 and has continuously improved itself socially, economically, and politically to attain this end;

3. That Hawaii ceded its independence by annexation to the United States through voluntary action of the people of Hawaii;

4. That the Hawaiian Organic Act of April 30, 1900, provided "that the Constitution shall have the same force and effect within said Territory as elsewhere in the United States";

5. That Hawaii's political, economic, and social status commend it as a modern American community;

6. That Hawaii's educational system, both in the public schools and institutions of higher education, compare favorably with those in the States;

7. That both Army and Navy intelligence authorities testified that not a single act of sabotage was committed by any resident of Hawaii before, during, or after the attack on Pearl Harbor, and that these same authorities commended the important patriotic service rendered, under the most critical conditions, in military intelligence and war work by all citizens of Hawaii, regardless of racial origin;

8. That the present population of 519,423 is larger than any other State upon admission to the Union, except Oklahoma; that almost 90 percent of the population are American citizens and that the proportion of American-born citizens is continually expanding, due to the influx of mainland American citizens and the mortality among older residents of alien origin;

9. That the strategic location in the mid-Pacific of Hawaii's modern community of a half-million loyal American citizens, with its modern facilities for transportation, communication, and defense is of immeasurable value to the Nation;

10. That the granting of statehood to Hawaii at this time will be an actual demonstration of the purposes of the United States in granting self-determination to the peoples of the world.

11. That the joint committee of the Seventy-fifth Congress appointed in 1937, after thorough investigation in the islands, found "that Hawaii has fulfilled every requirement for statehood heretofore exacted of Territories"; and

12. That the subcommittee appointed in the Seventy-ninth Congress unanimously recommended that immediate consideration for legislation looking to the admission of Hawaii to statehood be undertaken.

The House Public Lands Committee of the Eightieth Congress unanimously approved H. R. 49, concluding its report with the following words:

"On the basis of the voluminous testimony, exhibits, and factual evidence consistently submitted to this and former congressional committees, the Committee on Public Lands is unanimously convinced that the Territory of Hawaii has met every necessary requirement to be admitted as a State of the Union."

The extent of Communist influence and activity in the Territory has been the object of extensive inquiry. One of the most recent was that conducted by Senator Guy Cordon, of Oregon, as a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Eightieth Congress. The Senator explored all aspects of this problem and came to the conclusion that it constituted no barrier to statehood for Hawaii. This committee is of the opinion that the people of the Territory are alert to the problem and would be better able to cope with it as a State than as a Territory.

CONCLUSION

The islands, one of America's two "incorporated" or fully organized Territories, are governed in much the same manner as are States, but with a number of important differences. The Territory enjoys only the barest modicum of influence in national affairs. The Governor is not elected by the people, but is appointed by the President, as are all Federal officers. Administrative officials, however, are appointed by the Governor. The legislature, bicameral and con-

sisting of 45 members, functions in general like a State legislature, but its every act is subject to Federal repudiation. The "constitution" of the islands remains the Organic Act of April 30, 1900.

Certainly no legitimate objection to statehood can be raised on the ground of economics, for the Territory is not only self-supporting but pays more Federal income tax than does any 1 of 12 States. Hawaii has continually contributed more to the United States Treasury than has been expended by the Federal Government—excluding military appropriations—in the Territory's behalf.

Had Hawaii been a State, it hardly would have been subjected to the indignities which befell it during World War II. Statehood would preclude the discrimination against Hawaii which has been contained in Federal legislation from time to time. It would prevent the continuance of the unwarranted and expensive practice followed by many mainland firms of preparing "export" forms for goods sent to Hawaiian retailers, erroneously regarded as foreigners.

It has been noted by the committee that objection to statehood for Hawaii from some sources revolves around the racial question. Every congressional investigation has disclosed that there is virtually no race problem in the Territory. Almost 90 percent of the people of the Territory today are American citizens. Certainly there is no area under United States jurisdiction where a greater complexity of races lives so harmoniously. Statehood would further enhance this harmonious intermingling of the various racial strains comprising the Hawaiian population, of which the largest percentage is Caucasian.

Public opinion polls of both Hawaiian and mainland sentiment have revealed that a large majority of all those interviewed favored statehood. Both major political parties in the United States included a recommendation of statehood for Hawaii in their party platforms of 1948.

Known as the crossroads of the Pacific, the Hawaiian Islands would be under statehood in an even better position to further the interests of all the Pacific peoples. Statehood would increase immeasurably the prestige of America throughout the Orient.

The prompt enactment of H. R. 49, as amended, is recommended by the Committee on Public Lands.

The favorable reports of the Department of the Interior, Department of Agriculture, and the National Military Establishment appear in this report as appendixes 5, 6, and 7, respectively.

The committee amendments to H. R. 49 are of a minor nature, consisting only of clarifying language.

APPENDIX 1

ANALYSIS OF H. R. 49, AS AMENDED

This bill has been drawn to conform as nearly as possible to the general pattern of previous enabling acts, taking into consideration the differences that resulted from the annexation of Hawaii through the ratification of the treaty of annexation by the Senate of Hawaii and the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 55 of July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750), known as the Newlands resolution.

Section 1 enables the Territory of Hawaii to become a State by complying with the provisions of this bill.

Section 2 provides for the election of 63 delegates apportioned among the counties and city and county, and the representative districts of Hawaii as outlined in detail, who shall form a constitutional convention; permits members of the Territorial legislature to serve as elected delegates to the convention; requires the Governor of Hawaii to issue a proclamation within 30 days after the approval of this act, ordering a primary election and a final election of delegates; and establishes all other requirements for the machinery to make effective such a constitutional convention.

Section 3 sets forth the time when such conventions shall be held, requires the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, requires that the constitution adopted shall be republican in form, conforming to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and that the constitution shall include the following provisions:

First. Freedom of religious worship.

Second. Establishment and maintenance of a public-school system, free from sectarian control.

Third. Assumption and payment of debts and liabilities of the Territory by the State.

Fourth. Cession of property to the United States that at the time of admission as a State has been set aside by Executive order of the President or the Governor of the Territory for the use of the United States.

Fifth. Recognition of exclusive legislative jurisdiction in the Congress of the United States as provided by article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States, over all land owned by the United States and held for military, naval, or Coast Guard purposes, but reserving the right of the State of Hawaii to serve civil or criminal processes on such land on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed within the State and not on such Government property.

Sixth. Requirement that as a compact with the United States the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, as amended, is adopted as a law of the State, subject to amendment or repeal only with the consent of the United States of those provisions which safeguard and protect the Hawaiian home-loan fund and the Hawaiian home-development fund, as well as those which protect the qualification of lessees, and the utilization of funds received from Hawaiian homelands as provided for in the afore-mentioned act; certain sections of the act relating to administration may be amended by the State.

Seventh: Requirement that nonresident American citizens shall not be taxed at a higher rate than residents of the State.

Section 4 (a) authorizes the State of Hawaii to retain all lands and other public property, title to which is in the Territory or a political subdivision of it, and which is not set aside by Executive order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii as provided for in section 3 (5).

Section 4 (b) provides that the United States shall retain title to all public lands and other public property for a period of 5 years after the enactment of this act, but that such land and public property shall continue to be administered by the Territory, and further provides for the creation of a joint congressional committee to make recommendation for the final disposition of these lands. In the event that action is not taken by Congress within 5 years after the enactment of this act, such lands, except those set aside by the Executive order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States or the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof, prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii, shall vest in the State of Hawaii absolutely.

Section 4 (c) authorizes the State of Hawaii to select 180,000 acres of public lands within 5 years from its admission as a State in lieu of any and all grants provided for new States by any other provisions of law, and authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for such land.

Section 4 (d) requires that such lands patented to the State of Hawaii by section 4 (c), together with the proceeds and income from them, shall be held by the State as a public trust for the support of public schools and educational institutions, the betterment of native Hawaiians as defined in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, as amended, for the development of farm and home ownership, and for making public improvements; also requires that such lands, proceeds, and income shall be disposed of for these purposes as the constitution and laws of the State may provide, but that if used for any other purposes shall constitute a breach of trust; and further requires that such public schools or educational institutions shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the State and none of the proceeds or incomes from the lands shall be used for the support of any sectarian institution.

Section 4 (e) repeals all laws of the United States reserving to the United States the free use or enjoyment of the property above vested in the State of Hawaii or its political subdivision.

Section 5 requires the submission to the people for ratification of the constitution formed by the convention, together with any ordinances requiring such submission, within certain time limitations, and appoints the secretary, Governor, and chief justice of the Territory as a canvassing board to which the returns shall be submitted; requires the canvassing board to certify the result of the election to the Governor; provides further that if the constitution is rejected the Governor shall reassemble the constitutional convention to frame a new constitution for submission to the electorate; and also provides that when a constitution shall have been ratified by the people, a certified copy of the same, together with any other matters voted upon, shall be submitted to the President of the United States for approval, with a statement of the votes cast; if the President advises that it conforms to all of the provisions of this act,

he shall approve the constitution, the separate provisions and ordinances, certifying the same to the Governor, whereupon the Governor shall issue a proclamation for the election of officers for all elective offices, as required by the constitution, including two Senators and two Representatives in Congress.

In the event that the President disapproves any provision separately voted upon by the people or any ordinance of the convention, he is required to certify that fact to the Governor, who shall call for another election as though such provisions and ordinances had been rejected by the people; and if the President disapproves the constitution, he will certify that fact to the Governor, whereupon the Governor by proclamation shall call another constitutional convention to frame a new constitution for submission to the people.

Section 6 provides that in the event of the approval by the President of the constitution, an election, or primary and general elections, as may be required, shall be held as provided for in section 5 within certain time limitations, when the officers required by section 5 shall be chosen in accordance with the constitution and laws of the State for the election of members of the State legislature, whereupon the returns shall be canvassed and certified in accordance with this act. When the Governor has certified the same to the President of the United States, the President shall immediately issue a proclamation admitting Hawaii as a State on an equal footing with other States.

This section further provides that in the interim, until their successors are elected or selected as may be required by ordinances or the constitution ratified by the people, present legislative, executive, and judicial officers, as well as the Delegate to Congress, shall continue to discharge their duties, and further requires that the Governor and secretary of state shall certify the election of Senators and Representatives, who shall be admitted to seats with all rights and privileges in the Congress of the United States.

Section 7 amends subsection (a) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for apportioning Representatives in Congress among the several States by the equal-proportions method, approved November 15, 1941" (2 U. S. C. 1946 ed., sec. 2b), by temporarily increasing the size of the House of Representatives from 435 to 437 Members, the two additional Members to represent Hawaii, until the expiration of the Eighty-second Congress, when reapportionment will take place for the entire country, including the State of Hawaii, on the basis of the equal-proportions method.

Section 8 authorizes an appropriation of \$200,000 for defraying the expenses of the elections, the convention, and the compensation of Delegates under this act and stipulates the rate and method of making such expenditures; it also authorized the Territorial legislature to appropriate additional funds for the compensation of Delegates, for defraying their expenses, and so forth.

Section 9 establishes the State of Hawaii as a judicial district within the ninth judicial circuit; authorizes the appointment of two judges to the district court thus created and makes all laws of the United States relating to district courts applicable; it further directs the regular terms of the courts to be held at Honolulu on the second Monday in April and October and that the office of the clerk of court shall be kept at Honolulu.

Section 10, as amended, provides that the District of Hawaii shall include, in addition to the State of Hawaii, the Midway, Wake, Johnston, Sand, Kure, Baker, Howland, and Jarvis Islands, and Kingman Reef.

Section 11 directs the appointment of a clerk for the district court, a United States attorney, a United States marshal for the district, and such assistants, deputies, court officers, and clerical and other personnel now authorized by law.

Section 12 authorizes the transfer and the continuance of court proceedings without abatement in any actions, cases, proceedings, or matters pending in the courts of the Territory of Hawaii to the new United States district court and stipulates that any civil or criminal actions for causes prior to admission and pending on the date of admission shall be subject to prosecution in the appropriate State courts or the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii.

Section 13 provides for the continuity of rights of appeal from and appellate review of final decisions of the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii or the Territorial supreme court in the transfer of jurisdiction to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States, at the same time giving all parties the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of judgments and decrees of the Territorial district and supreme court to the United States district court, the United States court of appeals, and the Supreme Court of the United States, as may be provided by law in any case arising subsequent to admission as a State.

Section 14, as amended, excludes Hawaii from the application of certain sections of title 28, United States Code.

Section 15 provides that all laws of the Territory of Hawaii in force at the time of its admission as a State shall continue except as modified or changed by this act, by the State constitution, or by ordinance of the constitutional convention ratified by the people, and shall be subject to repeal or amendment by the State legislature except as provided in this act with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, as amended; and further provides that the laws of the United States shall have the same force and effect in Hawaii as elsewhere in the United States.

Section 16 continues the jurisdiction of the United States over the Hawaiian National Park but reserves to the State of Hawaii the same rights held by the Territory of Hawaii under section 1 of the act of April 19, 1930 (46 Stat. 227), but granting the right to vote to all persons residing in that area and provides that all references to the Territory of Hawaii in the said act or in other laws relating to the Hawaiian National Park shall be deemed to refer to the State of Hawaii. As amended, it contains a proviso that nothing in the act shall affect the ownership by the United States of any property within Hawaii National Park which may now belong to or hereafter be acquired by the United States.

Section 17 repeals all previous acts of the Territorial legislature or the Congress that are in conflict with the provisions of this act.

APPENDIX 2

RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF HAWAII RATIFYING THE TREATY OF ANNEXATION OF 1897

The "consent" referred to in the preamble of the joint resolution to provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States is expressed in the following resolution of the Senate of the Republic of Hawaii:

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Republic of Hawaii, That the Senate hereby ratifies and advises and consents to the ratification by the President of the treaty between the Republic of Hawaii, and the United States of America on the subject of the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States of America, concluded at Washington on the 16th day of June A. D. 1897, which treaty is, word for word, as follows:

"The Republic of Hawaii and the United States of America, in view of the natural dependence of the Hawaiian Islands upon the United States, of their geographical proximity thereto, of the preponderant share acquired by the United States and its citizens in the industries and trade of said Islands, and of the expressed desire of the government of the Republic of Hawaii that those Islands should be incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof, and under its sovereignty, have determined to accomplish by treaty, an object so important to their mutual and permanent welfare.

"To this end the high contracting parties have conferred full powers and authority upon their respectively appointed plenipotentiaries, to wit:

"The President of the Republic of Hawaii: Francis March Hatch, Lorrin A. Thurston, and William A. Kinney.

"The President of the United States: John Sherman, Secretary of State of the United States.

"ARTICLE I. The Republic of Hawaii hereby cedes absolutely and without reserve to the United States of America all rights of sovereignty of whatsoever kind in and over the Hawaiian Islands and their dependencies; and it is agreed that all the territory of and appertaining to the Republic of Hawaii is hereby annexed to the United States of America under the name of the Territory of Hawaii.

"ARTICLE II. The Republic of Hawaii also cedes and hereby transfers to the United States the absolute fee and ownership of all public, government, or crown lands, public buildings or edifices, ports, harbors, military equipment, and all other public property of every kind and description belonging to the government of the Hawaiian Islands, together with every right and appurtenance thereunto appertaining.

"The existing laws of the United States relative to public lands shall not apply to such lands in the Hawaiian Islands; but the Congress of the United States shall enact special laws for their management and disposition: *Provided*, That all revenue from or proceeds of the same, except as regards such part thereof as may be used or occupied for the civil, military, or naval purposes of the United States, or may be assigned for the use of the local government, shall be used solely for the benefit of the inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands for educational and other public purposes.

"ARTICLE III. Until Congress shall provide for the government of such Islands, all the civil, judicial, and military powers exercised by the officers of the existing government in said Islands shall be vested in such person or persons, and shall be exercised in such manner, as the President of the United States shall direct; and the President shall have power to remove said officers and fill the vacancies so occasioned.

"The existing treaties of the Hawaiian Islands with foreign nations shall forthwith cease and determine, being replaced by such treaties as may exist, or as may be hereafter concluded, between the United States and such foreign nations. The municipal legislation of the Hawaiian Islands, not enacted for the fulfillment of the treaty so extinguished and not inconsistent with this treaty, not contrary to the Constitution of the United States, nor to any existing treaty of the United States, shall remain in force until the Congress of the United States shall otherwise determine.

"Until legislation shall be enacted extending the United States Customs laws and regulations to the Hawaiian Islands, the existing Customs relations of the Hawaiian Islands with the United States and other countries shall remain unchanged.

"ARTICLE IV. The public debt of the Republic of Hawaii, lawfully existing at the date of the exchange of the ratifications of this Treaty, including the amounts due to depositors in the Hawaiian Postal Savings Bank, is hereby assumed by the Government of the United States; but the liability of the United States in this regard shall in no case exceed \$4,000,000. So long, however, as the existing government and the present commercial relations of the Hawaiian Islands are continued, as hereinbefore provided, said Government shall continue to pay the interest on said debt.

"ARTICLE V. There shall be no further immigration of Chinese into the Hawaiian Islands except upon such conditions as are now or may hereafter be allowed by the laws of the United States, and no Chinese by reason of anything herein contained shall be allowed to enter the United States from the Hawaiian Islands.

"ARTICLE VI. The President shall appoint five Commissioners, at least two of whom shall be residents of the Hawaiian Islands, who shall, as soon as reasonably practical, recommend to Congress such legislation concerning the Territory of Hawaii as they shall deem necessary or proper.

"ARTICLE VII. This treaty shall be ratified by the President of the Republic of Hawaii, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in accordance with the Constitution of the said Republic, on the one part; and by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, on the other; and the ratifications hereof shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

"In witness whereof, the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the above articles and have hereunto affixed their seals.

"Done in duplicate at the City of Washington, this sixteenth day of June, one thousand eight-hundred and ninety-seven.

"FRANCIS MARCH HATCH.

"LORRIN A. THURSTON.

"WILLIAM A. KINNEY.

"JOHN SHERMAN.

"I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted at the Special Session of the Senate of the Republic of Hawaii on the 9th day of September A. D. 1897.

"WILLIAM C. WILDER, *President*.

"Attest:

"J. F. CLAY, *Clerk of Senate*."

APPENDIX 3

JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 55, To provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States

Whereas the Government of the Republic of Hawaii, having in due form, signified its consent, in the manner provided by its constitution, to cede absolutely and without reserve to the United States of America all rights of sovereignty of whatsoever kind in and over the Hawaiian Islands and their dependencies, and also to cede and transfer to the United States the absolute fee and ownership of all public, Government, or Crown lands, public buildings or edifices, ports, harbors, military equipment, and all other public property of every kind and description belonging to the Government of the Hawaiian Islands, together with every right and appurtenance thereunto appertaining: Therefore

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That said cession is accepted, ratified, and confirmed, and that the said Hawaiian Islands and their dependencies be, and they are hereby, annexed as a part of the territory of the United States and are subject to the sovereign dominion thereof, and that all and singular the property and rights hereinbefore mentioned are vested in the United States of America.

The existing laws of the United States relative to public lands shall not apply to such lands in the Hawaiian Islands; but the Congress of the United States shall enact special laws for their management and disposition: *Provided*, That all revenue from or proceeds of the same, except as regards such part thereof as may be used or occupied for the civil, military, or naval purposes of the United States, or may be assigned for the use of the local government shall be used solely for the benefit of the inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands for educational and other public purposes.

Until Congress shall provide for the government of such islands, all the civil, judicial, and military powers exercised by the officers of the existing government in said islands shall be vested in such person or persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct; and the President shall have the power to remove said officers and fill the vacancies so occasioned.

The existing treaties of the Hawaiian Islands with foreign nations shall forthwith cease and determine, being replaced by such treaties as may exist, or as may be hereafter concluded, between the United States and such foreign nations. The municipal legislation of the Hawaiian Islands, not enacted for the fulfillment of the treaties so extinguished, and not inconsistent with this joint resolution nor contrary to the Constitution of the United States nor to any existing treaty of the United States, shall remain in force until the Congress of the United States shall otherwise determine.

Until legislation shall be enacted extending the United States customs laws and regulations to the Hawaiian Islands the existing customs relations of the Hawaiian Islands with the United States and other countries shall remain unchanged.

The public debt of the Republic of Hawaii, lawfully existing at the date of the passage of this joint resolution, including the amounts due to depositors in the Hawaiian Postal Savings Bank, is hereby assumed by the Government of the United States; but the liability of the United States in this regard shall in no case exceed four million dollars. So long, however, as the existing government and the present commercial relations of the Hawaiian Islands are continued as hereinbefore provided said Government shall continue to pay the interest on said debt.

There shall be no further immigration of Chinese into the Hawaiian Islands, except upon such conditions as are now or may hereafter be allowed by the laws of the United States; no Chinese, by reason of anything herein contained, shall be allowed to enter the United States from the Hawaiian Islands.

The President shall appoint five commissioners, at least two of whom shall be residents of the Hawaiian Islands, who shall, as soon as reasonably practicable, recommend to Congress such legislation concerning the Hawaiian Islands as they shall deem necessary or proper.

SEC. 2. That the commissioners hereinbefore provided for shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

SEC. 3. That the sum of one hundred thousand dollars, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and to be immediately available, to be expended at the discretion of the President of the United States of America, for the purpose of carrying this joint resolution into effect.

Senate joint resolution adopted July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750).

APPENDIX 4

[H. Rept. No. 1620, 79th Cong., 2d sess.]

LETTER TRANSMITTING REPORT

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1946.

HON. HUGH PETERSON,
*Chairman, Committee on the Territories,
House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am privileged to submit herewith a report of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Territories of the inspection trip made by the members of the subcommittee to the Territory of Hawaii during the month of January 1946.

This report is submitted in accordance with House Resolution 236, adopted by the House of Representatives on May 28, 1945.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee of the Committee on the Territories.

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES, THE
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Honorable HUGH PETERSON,
Chairman of the Committee on the Territories, Washington, D. C.

The first congressional committee to hold hearings on the question of admitting Hawaii to statehood visited the Territory in October 1935. After extensive hearings it found "the Territory of Hawaii to be a modern unit of the American Commonwealth, with a political, social, and economic structure of the highest type. Its educational program is an advanced one, with a large proportion of the tax dollar being spent for the training of its youth. Even during the period of the depression this program was neither relaxed nor reduced, and its school facilities compare favorably with those of the most-advanced States. Hawaii's economic standards are high, with an industrial and agricultural development forming a sound basis for the continued growth of the Territory."

The committee concluded that considerable further study was necessary before a favorable report could be made on the bill to admit Hawaii to statehood.

In October 1937 a joint congressional committee, pursuant to a concurrent resolution adopted by the United States Senate and House of Representatives, visited the Territory of Hawaii and it concluded that while great progress had been made by the people of Hawaii in every phase of activity the question of statehood, because of disturbed international affairs, should be deferred by the Congress until further study and consideration could be given to this matter. It was the committee's views also "that unmistakable evidence that a substantial majority desired statehood should precede affirmative action by Congress."

A plebiscite to determine this question was authorized by the Territorial legislature in 1939. Of all those voting on the question at the general election of November 5, 1940, 67 percent favored statehood and 33 percent were against. Dr. Gallup, in 1941, in a poll of the people on the mainland on this question, found that opinion in the continental United States in favor of statehood was in almost the same proportion as the plebiscite.

As the joint committee in 1937 recommended deferment of the question until the international situation became more settled, the people of Hawaii, with the end of the war in view, through their officials in the Territorial senate and house of representatives, adopted resolutions by overwhelming vote in each house that the Congress of the United States take immediate action on admitting Hawaii to statehood. Pursuant to this request and pursuant to the resolution (H. Res. 236) of the House of Representatives, dated April 30, 1945, the chairman of the Committee on Territories appointed a subcommittee to visit the Territory of Hawaii to hold hearings and to make recommendations on H. R. 3643, a bill introduced by Delegate Farrington, now pending, to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The subcommittee appointed by the chairman consists of Henry D. Larcade, Jr. (Democrat, Louisiana) (chairman); James J. Delaney (Democrat, New York); George P. Miller (Democrat, California); Homer D. Angell (Republican, Oregon); Dean P. Taylor (Republican, New York); and Joseph R. Farrington (Republican, Territory of Hawaii). Irwin W. Silverman, chief counsel of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions, Department of the Interior, was detailed by the Secretary of the Interior at the committee's request to serve as counsel of the committee.

On December 20, 1945, just prior to the committee's departure, the Secretary of the Interior, whose department has jurisdiction over the Territories, issued a statement endorsing statehood for Hawaii.

The counsel of the committee, Mr. Silverman, preceded the arrival of the committee by several days to make preparations for the hearings and to arrange for the scheduling of a large number of witnesses who had indicated their desire to appear before the committee. The subcommittee, which you appointed, arrived in Honolulu on Sunday, January 6. Hearings were held by the committee in the Throne Room, Iolani Palace, on Monday, January 7, and continued through Thursday, January 10. In order that all the people on all the islands of the Territory might be given an opportunity to be heard on this important question, hearings were held on Maui on Friday, January 11; on Molokai on Saturday, January 12; at Kona on Sunday, January 13; and in Hilo, on the island of Hawaii, on Monday, January 14. The committee returned to Honolulu on Monday, January 14, and held hearings in Honolulu on Tuesday, January 15, including a night session, through Thursday, January 17. It held hearings at Kauai on Friday, January 18, and left for the mainland on the 19th.

Prior to and at the beginning of the hearings the committee stated that full opportunity would be given to every person who desired to appear before the committee to present his or her views on the question of statehood and upon any other matter relating to the welfare of the Territory. About 100 witnesses were heard and examined in minute detail by the members of the subcommittee. In addition, a large number of valuable statements, memoranda, and statistical materials covering all of the social, political, and economic aspects of the islands were prepared by the heads of the Federal and Territorial agencies, as well as by experts representing industrial, trade, labor, and civil organizations. The committee gave special attention to questions pertaining to population trends, land ownership, the concentration of wealth, and to labor conditions.

FINDINGS

On the basis of this detailed and voluminous record the committee finds—

1. That the population of the Territory of Hawaii in 1945 was 502,122. Ethnically, the population consists of 10,988 Hawaiians, or 2.2 percent of the total populations; part-Hawaiians, 61,422, or 12.2 percent; Puerto Ricans, 9,090, or 1.8 percent; Caucasians, 172,583, or 34.4 percent; Chinese, 30,005, or 6 percent; Japanese, 163,300, or 32.5 percent; Koreans, 7,042 or 1.4 percent; Filipinos, 46,464, or 9.3 percent; all others, 1,228, or 0.2 percent.

2. That the Hawaiians have declined from an estimated 300,000 persons in 1778 to 10,988 in 1945.

3. That the Caucasian population has increased steadily since 1878, when the percentage of the total population was 5.09 percent.

4. That persons of Japanese ancestry in 1890 numbered 12,360, or 13.7 percent of the total population. By 1920 it increased to 42.7 percent, declined to 37.9 percent in 1930, and to date is placed at 32.5 percent, numbering 163,300 persons.

5. That since 1912 the proportion of interracial marriages has increased from 14.1 to 38.5 percent—the recent war has accentuated this trend. During the war years, over one-third of the children born had two or more racial strains.

6. That well over 85 percent of the present population were born in Hawaii or on the mainland.

7. That the war record of Hawaii is in every respect commendable. Hawaii had a full-scale organization for civilian defense and volunteer defense units sponsored by the Army, as well as participating in the usual Red Cross, USO, blood bank, and similar activities, making liberal contributions to the war chest and oversubscribing for war bonds. The Territory established a number of emergency agencies, such as a bureau of registration and identification, office of food control and food production, and a commercial rent-control program.

8. That Hawaii did its part in contributing men to the armed forces. Selective service did not apply to Hawaii during the first 2 years of the war because of the

Territory's crucial position and shortage of manpower. Since the application of the draft Hawaii has met its full quota.

Hawaii had two National Guard regiments, which were called into the Federal service on October 15, 1940. In all, 33,000 of the citizens of Hawaii served in the armed forces. Although Americans of Japanese ancestry constituted only 36 percent of the registrants under selective service, 52 percent of the total inductions from December 1940 to September 1945 came from this racial group because of the large numbers of volunteers. Because of the Army policy of organizing and segregating units composed of citizens of Japanese ancestry, it is possible to follow their activities and to compare their record with the distrust initially shown by the military commanders. Hawaii residents of Japanese ancestry constituted the entire original One Hundredth Infantry Battalion and by far the major part of the original Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team. The record of those units, made in major offensives in the European theater, includes 5 Presidential unit citations, 1 meritorious-service plaque, 65 Distinguished Service Crosses, 290 Silver Stars, 782 Bronze Stars, 10 Croix de Guerre (French), 3 soldiers' medals (Italian), 50 Army commendations, and 82 division commendations.

9. That according to Robert L. Shivers, Federal Bureau of Investigation agent in charge at Honolulu, there was not one single act of sabotage or fifth-column activity committed in Hawaii before, during, or after the attack on Pearl Harbor. Hawaii's people of various racial ancestries can and do work together. What goes on in the countries of their ancestors is of minor concern to them compared to their interest in the United States. People of all racial ancestries cooperated in preparing for and prosecuting the war, and Hawaii, despite its polyracial composition, is essentially American in thought, purpose, and action.

10. That the people of the Territory of Hawaii are a law-abiding people. Its different racial groups live together with a minimum of friction and no racial clashes; life and property are as safe in Hawaii as in any section of the mainland.

11. That such evidence of "block voting" as exists indicates that the practice has not assumed, and is not likely to assume, serious proportions. Members of the Territorial legislature whose ancestry is Japanese constitute normally less than 20 percent of the total membership, although 32.5 percent of the total population of the islands is of Japanese descent.

12. That in 1944, 71,704 of 84,326 registrants, or 85.03 percent, voted in the general election. The percentage of registered voters of Hawaiian ancestry declined from 33.8 percent in 1932 to 24.7 percent in 1940; Caucasian votes declined from 38.2 percent in 1932 to 30.1 percent in 1940. The Japanese showed an increase from 17.6 to 31.1 percent. With few exceptions, the percentage of registrants voting in each general election ranged between 85 to 90 percent.

13. That of the Territory's 4,118,400 acres, 1,762,050 acres, or 42.78 percent, is in public ownership and 2,356,350 acres, or 57.22 percent, are privately owned. The largest single owner has 8.87 percent of the total of privately owned lands, and the 10 largest owners (including the largest owner) together hold 30.11 percent; the 50 largest owners (including the 10 largest owners) hold 39.55 percent; and all other owners hold 17.67 percent of all privately owned land.

14. That the largest owner is the B. P. Bishop Estate, holding approximately 370,000 acres. This is a charitable trust, founded by a Hawaiian princess for the support of the Kamehameha schools, which are devoted to the education of Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians, and the expenses of administering the trust are paid from trust funds.

15. That of the Territory's total 4,118,400 acres, 2,947,330 acres are devoted as follows: 1,045,085 acres are devoted to forest reserves; 164,205 acres to national parks; 84,040 acres to Army, Navy, or other public use (including Territorial and county purposes but not including highways); 1,350,000 acres to pasturage; 220,000 acres to the growing of sugarcane; 63,000 acres to the growing of pineapples; and approximately 21,000 acres to the growing of other crops, including 6,760 acres, truck farming; 4,000 acres, coffee; 2,090 acres, fruits; 2,067 acres, taro and field crops; 770 acres macadamia nuts; and 5,438 acres for miscellaneous crops.

16. That in 1940 there were 2,094 farms of less than 5 acres, and 4,724 farms of less than 100 acres (including those less than 5 acres).

17. That in 1944 Hawaii produced 874,946 tons of sugarcane, the crop being valued at \$65,498,535.

18. That in 1940 (the latest year for which complete figures are available) Hawaii produced 22,341,429 cases of pineapple valued at \$45,851,706.

19. That the coffee production of the islands in 1944 totaled 7,656,000 pounds, valued at \$1,091,000.

20. That the Territory has consistently paid into the United States Treasury a considerably larger amount than the Federal Government, exclusive of military expenditures, has spent upon the Territory.

21. That in 1944 and 1945 Hawaii exceeded several States in the total of its internal-revenue collections. In 1945 Hawaii paid into the Federal Treasury \$173,999,227.22.

22. That the finances of the Territory have been very well managed. At the end of the last biennium on June 30, 1945, total budgetary resources of the Territory amounted to \$68,339,384, with total obligations and reserves in the amount of \$57,873,691, leaving an unappropriated surplus of \$10,465,693. The bonded debt of the Territory as of December 31, 1945, was \$16,520,000, with \$7,151,344 in the sinking fund, leaving a net amount of \$9,368,656.

23. That during the calendar year 1945, the following tax revenues were produced from the following sources:

Real property.....	\$6, 568, 605. 43
Personal property.....	3, 697, 620. 65
Income: Personal and corporation.....	3, 529, 447. 21
Public utility.....	1, 897, 497. 05
Liquid fuel.....	1, 932, 749. 57
Compensation and dividend.....	8, 819, 507. 92
Bank excise.....	50, 000. 00
Liquor.....	1, 908, 979. 50
Tobacco.....	422, 664. 86
Gross income and consumption.....	10, 460, 310. 25
Unemployment compensation.....	1, 888, 749. 18
Business excise, poll, public welfare (prior years).....	96, 468. 83
Administered by tax commissioner.....	41, 272, 600. 45
Inheritance and estate.....	661, 274. 16
Insurance.....	451, 472. 58
Miscellaneous licenses.....	10, 252. 63
Administered by Territorial treasurer.....	1, 122, 999. 37
Total.....	42, 395, 499. 82

24. That there are 35 sugar companies operating in the Territory with a total capitalization of approximately \$175,000,000, and with stock held by approximately 16,000 persons. That there are five corporations, known as the Big Five, which act in the capacity of factors or agents for practically all of these plantations, and to some extent have substantial stockholdings in the plantation companies. The companies, with the number of plantations represented and the approximate percentage of sugar production for each group of plantations, are as follows:

	Number of plantations represented	Approximate percentage of total sugar production
American Factors, Ltd.....	9	30.8
C. Brewer & Co., Ltd.....	14	23.5
Alexander & Baldwin.....	4	20.8
Castle & Cooke, Ltd.....	3	14.5
Theo. H. Davies, Ltd.....	4	6.9
Total.....	34	96.5

The agency system is not used to such a predominant extent in the pineapple industry, although some of the Big Five are connected with that industry through stock ownership or other affiliation. The Big Five has other interests as well.

25. That the commerce of Hawaii with the continental United States exceeds that between the mainland and all but a few foreign countries. From 1935 to

1940 only five foreign countries—the United Kingdom, Canada, Japan, France, and Germany—bought more from the mainland than did Hawaii. In 1940 the value of the Territory's imports from the mainland totaled \$127,539,539, while the value of exports to the mainland was \$102,145,130.

26. That bank deposits have increased from \$4,662,131 in 1901 to \$493,295,940 in 1945, a good deal of the increase in later years being due, of course, to military and naval operations in the area.

27. That Hawaii's gross assessed value of real property is over \$500,000,000, higher than that of any State at the time of admission with the exception of Oklahoma.

28. That as of December 1945, 36,875 corporations, firms, or individuals were engaged in 54,412 different enterprises as employers or self-employers.

(a) There were 12,918 persons or companies engaged in retailing, representing the following businesses:

Appliances	66	General merchandise	1,135
Auto dealers	42	Groceries	641
Auto supplies	69	Hardware	61
Bakeries	61	Household products	15
Barrooms and saloons	380	Jewelers	185
Books and stationery	34	Liquor stores	173
Building materials	10	Lumber	10
Chemicals	17	Meat dealers and meat markets	333
Cold drinks	206	Mill supplies	11
Confectionery	205	Music stores and composers	23
Curios and novelties	298	Newspapers	25
Department stores	12	Nurseries	88
Drugs	151	Office equipment and supplies	27
Dry goods	222	Optical	17
Electric supplies	21	Poultry	636
Equipment	43	Radio and radio supplies	67
Fish dealers and fish markets	532	Restaurants	952
Food products	481	Service stations	387
Fountain and lunchrooms	444	Shoe stores	68
Fruit and vegetable	713	Toilet articles and cosmetics	55
Furniture	91	Wearing apparel	172

(b) There were 2,999 companies or persons engaged in wholesaling, including the following types of wholesaling:

Appliances	14	Food products	109
Auto dealers	14	Fruit and vegetable dealers	280
Auto parts	36	Furniture	26
Bakeries	55	General merchandise	264
Beverages	11	Groceries	44
Block printing	19	Hardware	12
Boat building	10	Household products	5
Bottle dealers	21	Jewelers	70
Building materials	7	Junk dealers	8
Coconuts	9	Lauhala weaving	166
Confectioneries	23	Leis	19
Curios and novelties	137	Lumber	5
Drugs	39	Magazines	7
Dry goods	42	Meats	56
Electrical appliances	19	Music	9
Equipment	16	Tobacco	6
Feed	9	Toilet articles and cosmetics	11
Fish dealers	273	Toys	10
Florists	41	Wearing apparel	32

(c) Eight thousand three hundred and fifty-eight companies or persons were engaged in producing raw products, including—

Dairies	66	Hog raisers	589
Farming	1,051	Poultry producers	811
Fishing	350	Sugar growers	2,135
Flower growers	214	Vegetables and fruits	1,542

(d) 1,426 persons or companies were engaged in manufacturing, including—

Alcoholic beverages.....	12	Foods.....	137
Bakery products.....	86	Footwear.....	21
Block printing.....	17	Furniture.....	35
Chemical and fertilizer.....	30	Jewelry.....	16
Clothing.....	27	Mattresses and springs.....	12
Concrete, lime, and stone products..	11	Nonalcoholic beverages.....	38
Confectionery.....	20	Soap.....	7
Curios and novelties.....	88	Wood products.....	37

29. That out of a total of 170,000 employees (not including part-time work by school children under the schools' temporary program to meet the manpower shortage) the sugar industry employs about 24,500 workers. Pineapple agricultural labor (not including the canneries) is about 4,750; 11,300 are employed in manufacturing (excluding sugar); 10,700 in transportation, communication, and other utility services; 23,000 in wholesale and retail trades; 13,500 in various service industries; 7,400 in diversified agriculture; 6,600 in construction and quarrying; and 3,000 in financial, insurance, and real-estate establishments; 59,500 are in government service and 4,075 in domestic service.

30. That since 1937 the Territorial legislature passed a number of labor laws, creating the department of labor and industrial relations, and dealing with such matters as apprenticeship, child labor, vocational training, vocational rehabilitation, unemployment compensation, regulation of employment agencies, minimum wages and maximum hours, payment and collection of wages, workmen's compensation, and safety regulations.

31. That the Territory's department of labor is considered by the local representative of the Federal Labor Department as doing an able job, and the Territory's labor legislation as comparing very favorably with that of many progressive States, and in some respects is in advance thereof.

32. That the average cash wage paid to sugar employees in 1945 is in excess of \$5 per day for unskilled labor, not including the value of perquisites, which include housing, fuel, water, lights, and medical and hospital services. The cash wage paid in the pineapple industry is comparable. Wages paid industrial workers have advanced in Hawaii more than on the mainland during the period 1940-45 and Hawaii now is on a par with the mainland.

33. That a standard 8-hour day is in effect throughout the Territory.

34. That Hawaii is the only Territory or State with the exception of Wisconsin to pass a "little Wagner Act" extending collective bargaining to agricultural labor.

35. That unionization of labor has made strides during the past 10 years both in industry and agriculture; nearly all major industries, including the sugar and pineapple industries, are now organized or organization is pending.

36. That there are 46 organizations in the Territory affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, 68 with the CIO, 2 independent unions, and 5 government employees' organizations.

37. That in 1940 there were 7 strikes, involving 502 workers with 33,217 man-days lost; in 1941 there were 16 strikes, involving 2,530 workers, resulting in 34,241 man-days lost; in 1942 there were 2 strikes, involving 49 men, resulting in 67 man-days lost; in 1943 there were 4 strikes, involving 202 workers, resulting in 716 man-days lost; in 1944 there was 1 labor dispute, involving 6 men, with 60 man-days lost; and in 1945, up to November, there had been 9 strikes, involving 1,047 men, with 8,876 man-days lost.

38. That at the last Territorial election a majority of those elected to both houses were endorsed by organized labor.

39. That illiteracy in the islands among native-born citizens is almost nonexistent. Hawaii has well-equipped schools throughout the Territory, most villages or hamlets being provided with the proper educational facilities.

40. That the standards of instruction, according to the United States Chamber of Commerce, are the same as on the mainland and higher than those in many States. The average number of pupils enrolled per teacher is 27.9 in Hawaii, as compared with 31.4 in the United States urban schools and 26.1 in rural areas. The average pay per teacher in Hawaii is \$2,014 annually, as compared to \$2,013 in urban centers and \$1,018 in rural areas of the mainland.

41. That there is a public library on each of the principal islands. There are 82,435 registered card holders. Each island library owns a bookmobile serving rural schools and homes, and approximately \$620,000 is spent annually on library facilities.

42. That the University of Hawaii compares favorably with many State universities. For the year 1944-45 there were enrolled 1,463 regular students and 145 graduate students. The university had financial support in the amount of \$3,126,028 for the biennium 1943-45, of which Territorial appropriations from general revenues provided 50.8 percent, university income 27.46 percent, and Federal grants 21.74 percent.

43. That the level of the Territory's spiritual and moral life is in the best American tradition.

44. That in 1945 the board of health spent \$1,623,385, or a per capita cost of \$3.23 as compared with \$1.66 in 1937.

45. That in 1943 Hawaii' death rates from 18 causes were below the national median. It was higher for syphilis, tuberculosis and accidents including automobile accidents. The mortality rate of infants under 1 year had declined from 87 per thousand in 1930 to 30 per thousand in 1945; the number of maternal deaths for 1,000 living births had declined from 7 in 1932 to 1.6 in 1945.

46. That the venereal-disease infection rate per 1,000 in Hawaii declined from 175 in 1911 to 7.5 in 1945. On the mainland the rate has declined from 163 in 1911 to approximately 43 in 1945. In Hawaii the locally acquired rate was 1.4 in 1945.

47. That according to the Social Security Board, Hawaii's public-assistance program is based on "liberal progressive legislation." Hawaii has no maximum limitation of public assistance; thus the Territory has placed itself in a position to make payments to needy individuals, commensurate with need, and to give recognition to changes in living costs. Hawaii also has a medical- and dental-care program, and provides other forms of public assistance for which no Federal grants are given.

48. That in 1945 Hawaii ranged thirty-ninth in the average grant for old-age assistance, fifteenth in the average grant for aid to dependent children, thirty-fifth in average grant for aid to the blind, and fifteenth in the average grant for general assistance.

49. That the Territorial legislature has enacted legislation comparable to that of many States. Hawaii has adopted 20 of the mainland uniform laws. In addition to laws mentioned above, Hawaii has a civil-service law, a modern retirement system for all employees; in the field of public health the Territory enacted the crippled children's act, created the bureau of mental hygiene, passed a uniform narcotic drugs act, established compulsory vaccination for smallpox, typhoid, and other diseases. In addition to the existing public medical-care program the legislature in 1945 provided for a study of health insurance and hospital facilities. In 1935 the legislature created the Hawaii housing authority, passed the Federal Housing Act, authorizing the acquisition by any Federal agency of property suitable for housing projects, and an act entitled "Government Aid for Housing Projects," authorizing the Territory and its political subdivisions to aid in the planning, construction, and operation of housing projects.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the record, and in view of the foregoing, the subcommittee concludes—

1. That Hawaii, with a population of over 500,000, has a larger population than any other State at the time of admission to the Union with the exception of Oklahoma.

2. That the heterogeneous peoples of the Territory live and work together amicably, democratically, and harmoniously.

3. That the mixed racial complexion of Hawaii existed at the time of annexation, was not regarded as an obstacle to annexation, and should not now be considered an obstacle to statehood.

4. That the percentage of persons of Japanese ancestry reached its peak in 1940 and has declined steadily since then due to prohibition of immigration, lower birth rate, and the increasing immigration of other peoples.

5. That the people of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question their loyalty and patriotism to the Government of the United States.

6. That on the record of their behavior and their participation in the war, American citizens of Japanese ancestry can be little criticized.

7. That such evidence of "bloc voting" as exists among Americans of Japanese ancestry is not likely to assume serious proportions, because they, like other

peoples are divided amongst themselves by differences, political, social, and economic.

8. That Hawaii has been a Territory for 46 years, and now appears to be fully capable of self-government.

9. That there is a concentration of land holdings in the hands of a few persons, companies, or estates, but attempts have been made to improve the situation.

The 1943 legislature created a land-laws-revision commission, which recommended the creation of a public corporation for the acquisition, subdivision, and sale of lands for home sites. A bill of this character, known as the Hawaii Home Development Authority Act, was introduced in the last session. Although it failed of passage then, and no further steps have been taken, it may in the near future be enacted into law. It provided:

"The Authority is directed to acquire by purchase or eminent domain undeveloped lands suitable for residential purposes on the island of Oahu, where the acute shortage of homes sites exists. Lands thus acquired are to be subdivided into residential lots and offered for sale to those of the public most in need of houses. The development projects contemplated by the Act are self-sustaining in nature. The Act calls for an initial loan to the Authority to be repaid to the Territory as the Authority secures funds from its bonds, the issuance of which is provided for by the Act."

10. That the Big Five dominates a great portion of Hawaii's economy, but this economic dominance has not prevented the establishment of many and varied businesses. There are good prospects for small business in Hawaii. Further, the influence of the Big Five has not prevented the enactment of progressive legislation in the field of labor, education, health, and welfare.

11. That in many communities of similar size, business policies are formulated by a relatively small number of individuals who hold positions of responsibility. There is no occasion to believe that these positions are maintained through stock control either directly or by means of proxies in Hawaii to any greater extent than is the case in many of the cities on the mainland. The committee's investigations were in the main confined to statehood, but in all the evidence presented to it, nothing indicated the existence in business life of collusion or fraud or any agreement or combination in restraint of trade.

12. That labor has made great strides since 1937 and has contributed greatly to the Territory's progress in the field of social and economic legislation.

13. That there is a growing mutual respect and confidence between management and labor in industrial relations.

14. That the school system of Hawaii has been successful in instilling into the people of many races and backgrounds the objectives and ideals of democracy, and has produced a literate population capable of discharging the duties of citizenship.

15. That modern inventions have annihilated distance. Honolulu today is closer to the American mainland in time than the cities of Boston and New York were to the Capital in the early days of the Nation. Hawaii is closer to the seat of the Government today than all but the immediately adjacent States were when Washington first became the Capital of the United States. With efficient and rapid communication by cable, radio, or telephone, and 12- to 18-hour service for mail or passenger planes to the mainland. Hawaii can no longer be characterized as isolated.

16. That a majority of the people of the Territory are in favor of immediate statehood. No organized group has appeared in opposition. If a plebiscite were again held on the statehood question, in our opinion the people would vote for statehood in the same proportion as they did in 1940.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Therefore, since—

1. The people of the Territory of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question not only their loyalty and patriotism but also their desire to assume the responsibilities of statehood; and since

2. The policy of the United States Government is one of self-determination: that peoples be allowed to choose freely their form of political status; and since

3. Hawaii's strategic location in the Pacific plays so large a part in our country's international position in this area; and since

4. The Congress of the United States has through a series of acts and committee reports indicated to the people of the Territory that Hawaii would be admitted into the Union when qualified; and since

5. The Territory of Hawaii now meets the necessary requirements for statehood:

It is the recommendation of this subcommittee that the Committee on Territories give immediate consideration to legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood.

HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr., *Chairman.*

JAMES J. DELANEY.

GEORGE P. MILLER.

HOMER D. ANGELL.

DEAN P. TAYLOR.

JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON.

APPENDIX 5

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington 25, D. C., March 2, 1949.

HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS,
*Chairman, Committee on Public Lands,
House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. SOMERS: Further reference is made to your request of January 25, for my views on H. R. 49, a bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

I strongly urge the enactment of H. R. 49, with the amendments hereinafter suggested.

That the people of Hawaii now desire statehood is amply demonstrated by the fact that at a plebiscite in 1940 they voted 2 to 1 in favor of admission to the Union; there is little doubt that the odds would be even more heavily weighted if a poll were to be taken now. Mainland sentiment, too, is overwhelmingly in favor of statehood. The reasons for this sentiment in favor of statehood for Hawaii lie in a background of close political, economic, and social ties between the people of that Territory and the people of the continental United States. Hawaii, it must be remembered, voluntarily relinquished its status as a sovereign nation to enter into the American commonwealth. Today, after over a half century of active participation in the broader life of the whole American community, Hawaii is truly an integral part of our Nation, devoted to the democratic ideals and institutions of the United States. Modern transportation facilities have ended even the physical isolation of the Territory.

The eminent qualification of the people of Hawaii to govern themselves within the framework of the Union has been already amply evidenced by the mass of progressive and intelligent laws on their statute books, their advanced school system, and the wise management of their fiscal affairs. Hawaii has contributed, and will continue to contribute, to the national welfare in a manner of which we may all be proud. Hawaii imports from the continental United States most of its consumer goods, and exports to the mainland the greater part of the products of its two major industries, sugar and pineapple. The commerce of Hawaii with the mainland exceeds that between the mainland and but a few foreign countries. Hawaii has consistently paid into the National Treasury a considerably larger amount than the Federal Government has spent in the Territory, exclusive of national defense expenditures.

I have mentioned but a few of the many points that could be made in support of the case for Hawaii's becoming one of the United States. For a comprehensive and convincing demonstration of the Territory's present ability to assume the responsibilities of statehood, I refer you to the splendid record compiled by the subcommittee of the House Committee on Territories which held hearings on statehood in Hawaii during January 1946. Every possible aspect of Territorial life was examined and considered by the subcommittee. Hearings were held on the principal islands and opportunities were afforded all interested persons, whether in favor of or opposed to statehood, to be heard. On the basis of the hearings and exhibits, the subcommittee's report found that the total of Federal internal-revenue tax collections made in the Territory during 1944 and 1945 exceeded that of several States; that the gross assessed value of real property in Hawaii is higher than that of any State at the time of admission, with one exception; that illiteracy among native-born citizens is almost nonexistent; and that Hawaii, despite its polyracial composition, is essentially American in

thought, purpose, and action. The report also found that, notwithstanding the many racial groups, such evidence of bloc voting as exists indicates that the practice has not assumed and is not likely to assume serious proportions; and that the Hawaiians are very politically conscious, 85.03 percent of the registered voters having voted in the 1944 election. In the 1948 election, this figure increased to 86.5 percent. The subcommittee concluded that the mixed racial complexion of Hawaii should not be considered an obstacle to statehood; that the people of Hawaii have shown themselves capable of self-government; that though there is economic dominance by the Big Five of a great portion of Hawaii's economy, it has not prevented establishment of many varied businesses nor the passage of progressive labor, educational and social legislation; that a majority of the people in the Territory are in favor of immediate statehood; and that no organized opposition appeared.

On the basis of this extensive investigation, the House subcommittee recommended that immediate consideration be given to legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood. I unequivocally endorse that recommendation.

The public land provisions of H. R. 49 require particular mention, since these are the only provisions of the bill which, in my judgment, need substantial amendment. Hawaii contains approximately 1,775,000 acres of public lands. About 425,000 acres are set aside for various public uses—Federal, Territorial, or local—or are set aside as home lands for the native Hawaiians. The remaining 1,325,000 acres consist for the most part of forest, pastoral, and wastelands, but also comprise some highly productive agricultural lands. Ever since the annexation of Hawaii in 1898, title to and control of the public lands within its boundaries has been vested in the United States, but the administration of these lands, in general, has been placed in the hands of the Territorial government, subject to the governing laws passed by the Congress. The revenue is used by the Territorial government for the benefit of the local inhabitants under section 73 of the act of April 30, 1900 (31 Stat. 154, 48 U. S. C., sec. 666), as amended.

The provisions of H. R. 49 would retain in the United States title to the public lands now reserved for military establishments, national parks, or other Federal purposes, and would grant to the new State title to the public lands now reserved for the use of the Territorial government or any of its political subdivisions. Special provision would be made for the home lands in order to insure their permanent dedication to the uses prescribed by the Congress. All of these arrangements seem to have obvious merit, although certain perfecting amendments, particularly with respect to the national parks, appear desirable.

The bill would also grant to the new State the right to obtain title to 180,000 acres of public domain, to be selected by it out of the approximately 1,325,000 acres of land not covered by the foregoing dispositions. This right of selection would permit Hawaii to obtain title to all, or substantially all, of the sugarcane and other improved agricultural lands now belonging to the United States. Its effect would be to accord the new State a land grant at least as generous as that made to any of the existing States.

Finally, H. R. 49 provides that title to all the residue of the public lands in Hawaii, consisting mostly of forest reserves and pastoral and wastelands, shall remain in the United States for a period of 5 years and at the end of that period, if the Congress has made no other disposition of these areas, the title thereto shall vest automatically in the State of Hawaii. I believe that this provision is as unwise as it is unprecedented, and that the Federal Government should retain permanent control of these lands. All the people of the United States have an interest in the conservational use of the public lands in whichever State they are located. Our remaining reserves of natural resources should be utilized prudently in a manner consistent with the common welfare. It is the National Legislature which is best equipped to integrate the use of these lands with national needs.

The strategic location of the proposed State with respect to the national defense also emphasizes the desirability of the retention of control by the Federal Government. Congress may find it wise in the future to legislate so that the resources located in or on the public domain will be developed and marshaled along lines of possible military need. There is now in existence a Hawaii Land Use Coordinating Committee, composed of representatives of the local government, and the Army, Navy, and Interior Departments, which is engaged in reviewing the future needs of the Army and Navy in Hawaii, as well as the possible return to Territorial or private use of lands not necessary for defense. I believe that on the basis of this committee's study a realistic program for the distribution of lands between military and nonmilitary needs could be more

easily worked out than would be possible if the Federal Government should give up control of the lands now.

In view of these considerations, I recommend the inclusion in H. R. 49 of provisions which would permit Hawaii to enter into the Union on a basis similar to that on which the other States with public lands of the United States within their boundaries have been admitted. While Hawaii is entitled to a substantial land grant, the Federal Government should continue to hold the remainder of the public lands in Hawaii, for development and disposal in a manner consistent with the interests of the Nation as a whole.

Attached is a list of proposed amendments to H. R. 49 designed to carry out the foregoing recommendations. There are also included in the list minor changes recommended primarily for purposes of clarification. All of the suggested amendments are in line with those customary in acts for the admission of new States.

It is my sincere hope that consideration of the recommended amendments will not delay favorable action on statehood legislation. Hawaii's admission to the Union should not be impeded by prolonged discussion or controversy over the public-lands question. While the Department believes the public-land amendments should be adopted, its chief concern is that Hawaii be admitted to statehood at the earliest possible date. Therefore, should it appear likely that consideration of these amendments would block or prejudice favorable action on the bill, the Department will not press for their adoption.

For many years the Department of the Interior has been in a position to witness the rapid development of Hawaii's high standards of government in all matters affecting local welfare. This Department can also testify without reservation to the steadfast loyalty and patriotic vigilance of Hawaii's citizens during the critical and trying days of World War II. There is no question in my mind that, by any standard of judgment, these citizens of the United States have demonstrated their readiness for self-government as a State, and for full representation in the National Government.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that the objective of this proposed legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 49, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

1. The evident intent of paragraph "Fourth" of section 3 is to protect the interest of the United States in all of the property to be ceded to or retained by the United States under the terms of section 4, whether title to that property is now vested in the United States or in the Territory of Hawaii. However, the language used is not entirely apt to accomplish this purpose, since mention is made only of lands set aside by Executive order of the President or the Governor, whereas some of the lands involved, such as Hawaii National Park, have been set aside by act of Congress. Furthermore, while the word "ceded," as used in this paragraph, is appropriate to cover the lands now in Territorial ownership, the word "retained" also needs to be used in order to cover adequately the lands now in Federal ownership. Accordingly, the following revision of lines 11 to 16, page 8, is suggested:

"Fourth. That the property in the Territory of Hawaii set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union shall be ceded to or retained by the United States, as more particularly provided in the next section of this Act."

2. For reasons similar to those discussed in connection with the preceding amendment, it is suggested that in line 1, page 9, after the word "by", the words "Act of Congress or by" be inserted.

3. Paragraph "Fifth" of section 3 provides for the retention of exclusive jurisdiction in the United States over lands now held by it for military, naval, or Coast Guard purposes. This paragraph contains the customary saving clause reserving to the proposed new State the right to serve process within the areas involved, but omits the equally customary saving clauses reserving the right of the State to tax private property and preserving the voting rights of the inhabitants within these areas. It is believed that this paragraph would be more consonant with the exclusive jurisdiction provisions applicable to other Federal reservations if the semicolon in line 9, page 9, were changed to a comma and the

rest of line 9 and all of lines 10 and 11, page 9, were amended to read as follows: "and shall have the right to tax persons and corporations, their franchises and property, within the said tracts or parcels of land; and that persons now or hereafter residing on the said tracts or parcels of lands shall not be deprived thereby of the right to vote at all elections held within the political subdivisions where they respectively reside."

4. In order to include in the bill standard provisions found in the enabling acts of States heretofore admitted, framed in such a way as to be consistent with whatever arrangements for the disposition of the public lands are included in section 4, the following new paragraph should be inserted between lines 17 and 18, page 10:

"Eighth. That said State and its people do agree and declare that they forever disclaim all right and title to any lands or other property, including Hawaiian home lands, the title to which is retained in or ceded to the United States by the provisions of this Act, except insofar as provision may be contained in this Act for the transfer of any such lands or other property to said State; that until the title to such lands or other property is disposed of by the United States the same shall be and remain subject to the jurisdiction and control of the United States; that no taxes shall be imposed by said State upon any lands or other property belonging to or which may be hereafter acquired by the United States or reserved for its use; and that all provisions of this Act reserving rights or powers to the United States, as well as those prescribing the terms or conditions of the grant of lands or other property herein made to said State, are consented to fully by said State and its people."

5. To effectuate the recommendations in the accompanying report that the United States retain title to the public lands in Hawaii, the following changes are proposed:

A. Subsection (b) of section 4, constituting lines 9 to 25, page 11, and lines 1 to 11, page 12, should be revised to read as follows:

"(b) The United States and its instrumentalities, as the case may be, shall retain all the lands and other public property title to which is in the United States or an instrumentality thereof (including all lands and other property ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii upon its annexation to the United States or acquired in exchange for the lands or other property so ceded), except as herein provided, and all such lands and other property shall remain and be the absolute property of the United States and its instrumentalities, as the case may be, subject to the laws heretofore or hereafter enacted by the Congress for the management and disposition of such lands: *Provided, however,* That any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof (excluding lands or other property set aside merely as reserves for forest growth or conservation of water supply), whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, shall be and become the property of the State of Hawaii or of such political subdivision, absolutely or subject to such limitations, as the case may be."

B. New subsections (e) and (f) should be added to section 4 by inserting between lines 20 and 21, page 13, the following:

"(e) Upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the lands and other public property of the United States within said State shall, subject to the other provisions of this Act, continue to be administered in accordance with the laws applicable thereto immediately prior to the admission of said State, until otherwise provided by the Congress: *Provided, however,* That all powers and duties conferred by such laws upon any officer of the Territory of Hawaii, with respect to any of such lands or other property, except lands and property used in the administration of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, shall vest in the Secretary of the Interior and be administered, subject to his supervision and direction, in the Department of the Interior. Upon the application of the State of Hawaii, the said Secretary may, in his discretion, withdraw public lands within said State for administration as Hawaiian home lands and release Hawaiian home lands of equal value for administration as public lands.

"(f) All moneys derived by the United States after the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union from the sale, lease, or other disposal of public lands, as that term is defined in section 73 (a) of the Hawaiian Organic Act

(42 Stat. 116; 48 U. S. C., sec. 663), within the boundaries of said State shall, until otherwise provided by the Congress, be distributed as follows:

"(1) 37½ per centum to the State of Hawaii to be used solely for the benefit of the inhabitants thereof, for educational and other public purposes, as the legislature of said State may direct; and

"(2) 62½ per centum to the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury of the United States.

The foregoing distribution shall be in lieu of any and all existing provisions of law, except as otherwise provided herein, authorizing the payment to, or retention by, the Territory of Hawaii of moneys derived from lands or other property belonging to the United States, and such provisions shall cease to be effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii, except with respect to lands selected by, but not yet patented to, said State pursuant to this section, and except with respect to Hawaiian home lands as provided in section 3."

C. The present subsection (e), beginning at line 21, page 13, should be relettered as subsection (g).

6. The reference in section 10 to the act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784, ch. 662), has been made obsolete by the act of June 25 1948 (Public Law 773, 80th Cong.), which revised the Judicial Code and enacted into positive law title 28 of the United States Code. The act of August 13, 1940, has been superseded by section 91 of the new title 28, and has been specifically repealed by section 39 of the act of June 25, 1948. It is believed that section 10 should be recast by amending line 25, page 21, and lines 1 to 4, page 22, to read as follows:

"That the district of Hawaii shall include, in addition to the State of Hawaii, the places named in title 28, United States Code, section 91.

7. The references in section 14 to section 128 of the Judicial Code have likewise been made obsolete by the act of June 25, 1948 (Public Law 773, 80th Cong.), the provisions of the latter section having been superseded by section 1252 and sections 1291 to 1294 of the revised title 28 of the United States Code, and having been specifically repealed by section 30 of the cited act. It is believed that section 14 should be recast by amending lines 1 to 6, page 25, to read as follows:

"Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

"(a) title 28, United States Code, section 1252, is amended by excluding Hawaii from the application of the clause relating to courts of record;

"(b) title 28, United States Code, section 1293, is amended by striking out the words 'First and Ninth Circuits' and by inserting in lieu thereof 'First Circuit,' and by striking out the words 'supreme courts of Puerto Rico and Hawaii, respectively' and inserting in lieu thereof 'supreme court of Puerto Rico'; and

"(c) title 28, United States Code, section 1294, is amended by striking out paragraph (5) thereof and by renumbering paragraph (6) as paragraph (5)."

8. Consistent with the evident intent of the bill to retain in permanent Federal ownership the lands and other property held by the United States within the authorized boundaries of Hawaii National Park it is recommended that section 16 be amended by adding the following sentence at the end of line 5, page 26, of the bill:

"Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to affect the ownership and control by the United States of any lands or other property within Hawaii National Park which may now belong to, or which may hereafter be acquired by, the United States."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

Washington, March 3, 1949.

HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS,

Chairman, Committee on Public Lands,

House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SOMERS: This is in further reply to your request of January 25, 1949, for a report on H. R. 49, a bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

We have studied the bill and from the standpoint of this Department we have no particular suggestions to make. Enactment is recommended. We note, however, the use of the term "other public property" in subsection (b) of section 4, lines 10 and 24 of page 11. We assume that this term is not intended to include

personal property or real property acquired for a particular purpose. However, the meaning of the term is not clear, and it is suggested that consideration be given to its clarification.

Sincerely,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN, *Secretary.*

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 3, 1949.

HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS,
*Chairman, Committee on Public Lands,
House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your request for comments on H. R. 49, a bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, has been assigned to this Department by the Secretary of Defense for the preparation of a report thereon expressing the views of the National Military Establishment.

The purpose of the proposed bill is as stated in its title.

While a large percentage of the residents of the Territory of Hawaii are of Japanese ancestry, the National Military Establishment is aware of no acts of sabotage committed against the Government of the United States by the Japanese residents of the islands or by any other inhabitants of foreign extractions during World War II. In view of this fact and since the people of Hawaii, including many persons of Japanese ancestry, served with distinction in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, it is not considered that enactment of the proposed legislation would be detrimental to the interests of the United States from a military standpoint.

For the foregoing reasons the Navy Department, on behalf of the National Military Establishment, interposes no objection to the enactment of H. R. 49.

This report has been coordinated within the National Military Establishment in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The Navy Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the objective of the proposed legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

W. JOHN KENNEY, *Acting.*

RAMSEYER RULE

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2a, rule XIII, of the Rules of the House of Representatives, proposed changes in existing law are indicated below with the matter proposed to be omitted in black brackets, and the new matter proposed to be inserted in italics.

"ACT OF NOVEMBER 15, 1941 (U. S. C., 1940 EDITION, SUPP. V, TITLE 2, SEC. 2b)

"(a) Each State *other than Hawaii* shall be entitled, in the Seventy-eighth and in each Congress thereafter until the taking effect of a reapportionment under a subsequent statute or such section 22, as amended by this Act, to the number of Representatives shown in the statement transmitted to the Congress on January 8, 1941, based upon the method known as the method of equal proportions, no State to receive less than one Member [.] *; and the State of Hawaii shall be entitled to two Representatives from the time of its admission into the Union until the taking effect of such a reapportionment.*"

"ACT OF JUNE 25, 1948 (U. S. C., TITLE 28)

"SEC. 1252. Direct appeals from decisions invalidating Acts of Congress: Any party may appeal to the Supreme Court from an interlocutory or final judgment, decree or order of any court of the United States, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone and the District Court of the Virgin Islands and any court of record of Alaska, [Hawaii] and Puerto Rico, holding an Act of Congress unconstitutional in any civil action, suit, or proceeding to which the United States or any of its agencies, or any officer or employee thereof, as such officer or employee, is a party.

"A party who has received notice of appeal under this section shall take any subsequent appeal or cross appeal to the Supreme Court. All appeals or cross

appeals taken to other courts prior to such notice shall be treated as taken directly to the Supreme Court.

"Sec. 1293. The courts of appeals for the [First and Ninth Circuits] *First Circuit* shall have jurisdiction of appeals from all final decisions of the [supreme courts of Puerto Rico and Hawaii, respectively] *Supreme Court of Puerto Rico* in all cases involving the Constitution, laws or treaties of the United States or any authority exercised thereunder, in all habeas corpus proceedings, and in all other civil cases where the value in controversy exceeds \$5,000, exclusive of interest and costs.

"Sec. 1294. Circuits in which decisions reviewable: Appeals from reviewable decisions of the district and territorial courts shall be taken to the courts of appeals as follows:

"(1) From a district court of the United States to the court of appeals for the circuit embracing the district;

"(2) From the District Court for the Territory of Alaska or any division thereof, to the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit;

"(3) From the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, to the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit;

"(4) From the District Court of the Virgin Islands, to the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit;

"[(5) From the Supreme Court of Hawaii, to the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit;]

"[(6)] (5) From the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, to the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit."

[S. 156, 81st Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the inhabitants of all that part of the area of the United States no constituting the Territory of Hawaii, as at present described, may become the State of Hawaii, as hereinafter provided.

Sec. 2. That all citizens of the United States who have the qualifications for voters for representatives to the Territorial legislature are hereby authorized to vote for and choose delegates to form a convention in said Territory.

Such delegates shall possess the qualifications of such electors, and members of the Territorial legislature shall be eligible to election as such delegates, and with no resulting disqualification as such members of the Territorial legislature, the provisions of sections 16 and 17 of the Hawaiian Organic Act to the contrary notwithstanding.

The aforesaid convention shall consist of sixty-three delegates apportioned among the counties and city and county, and the representative districts within the limits of the proposed State on the following basis:

County of Hawaii, at large, four delegates;

First representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7; precincts 8, 9, 10, and 11; precincts 12, 13, and 14; precincts 15, 16, 30, and 17; precincts 18, 19, 20, 21, 31, and 22; precincts 23, 32, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29;

Second representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 16; precincts 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15.

County of Maui, at large, three delegates;

Third representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5; precincts 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11; precincts 9, 12, 13, and 28; precincts 14, 15, 16, and 17; precincts 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27; precincts 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34;

City and county of Honolulu, hereinafter included in the word "county", at large, twelve delegates;

Fourth representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 24, 25, and 26; precincts 19, 20, 21, and 22; precincts 15 and 16; precincts 12, 17, and 32; precincts 11 and 18; precincts 13 and 14; precincts 6 and 36; precincts 7 and 8; precincts 9 and 10; precincts 34 and 31; precincts 5 and 35; precincts 4, 30, and 33; precincts 1 and 2; precincts 3 and 29;

Fifth representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 5, 7, 30, and 31; precincts 6, 29, 8, and 9; precincts 10, 11, 32,

and 26; precincts 12, 33, and 13; precincts 14, 15, 16, and 17; precincts 18 and 19; precincts 22, 23, 28, and 27;

Fourth and fifth representative districts, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precinct 28, fourth district, and precincts 1, 2, 3, and 4, fifth district; precinct 27, fourth district, and precincts 20 and 21, fifth district; precinct 23, fourth district, and precincts 24 and 25, fifth district;

County of Kauai, at large, two delegates;

Sixth representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 1, 2, 3, and 4; precincts 5 and 6; precincts 8, 9, 10, and 11; and one delegate from precinct 7.

The precincts herein mentioned are as they existed on November 5, 1946.

The Governor of said Territory shall, within thirty days after the approval of this Act, issue a proclamation ordering a primary election for the nomination of candidates for the offices of the delegates aforesaid on a day designated by him in said proclamation, not earlier than sixty nor later than ninety days after the approval of this Act; and a final election not earlier than thirty, nor later than forty, days after such primary election.

The name of no candidate shall be printed upon any official ballot to be used at such primary election unless at least twenty days prior to such primary a nomination paper shall have been filed in the office of the secretary of the Territory in his behalf, nominating him as a candidate for delegate from the county concerned, or from a precinct or combination of precincts in a representative district or districts, as may be the case, and signed by not less than twenty-five qualified electors of the district concerned, and the sum of \$25 shall have been paid to the secretary of the Territory, which fee shall be a Territorial realization.

Each person shall be a qualified elector of the county or precinct or combination of precincts in which he is a candidate for delegate.

No such nomination paper shall contain any reference to or designation of any political party, and the ballots used at such election shall be nonpartisan and shall not contain any reference to or designation of the political party or affiliation of any candidate. The names of the candidates in each county and of the candidates in the precinct or combination of precincts of the representative districts shall be on separate ballots.

The ballots submitted to the voters of each county, precinct, or combination of precincts shall separately set forth the names of candidates for delegates from such county or precinct or combinations of precincts and shall instruct the voters that the number of candidates to be voted for by such voter shall not exceed the number of delegates to which the county, precinct, or combination of precincts is entitled, or the number of such delegates remaining to be elected, as the case may be, which number shall be stated. The ballots in each county shall also instruct the voters that the number of candidates to be voted for by each voter shall not be less than a majority of the number of delegates which such county is entitled to elect at the particular election, primary or final, as the case may be, and the number constituting such a majority shall be stated. At such primary election any candidate in a precinct or combination of precincts who receives a majority of the votes of the voters voting therein shall be declared elected, and any candidate in a county who receives such a majority of votes, not exceeding the number of delegates to be elected from each county, shall likewise be declared elected. The names of the remaining candidates receiving the highest number of votes, not exceeding two from each precinct or combination of precincts, or double the number of delegates to be elected at large from each county above the number already declared elected as aforesaid, if any, shall be placed on the ballot for the final election.

No ballot in a county ticket shall be counted at either the primary election or the final election unless the number of candidates voted for by the voter is at least equal to a majority of the number of delegates which the county concerned was entitled to elect at such election.

Only those nominated at such primary election shall be eligible to run for delegate at such final election. The ballots for such final election shall be in substantially the same form as those for the primary election, and the requirements of this Act as to such primary election shall, as far as appropriate, apply to such final election. In case of a tie vote at either the primary or final election, the candidates so tied shall draw lots under the supervision of the county clerk to determine which of them shall be nominated or elected as the case may be.

In case any office of delegate has not been filled or shall become vacant for any reason the Governor shall appoint an elector of the same county, precinct, or combination of precincts, to fill such vacancy.

Except as otherwise specifically provided by this Act, the primary and final elections for such delegates shall be conducted, the returns made, the results ascertained, and the certificates of persons elected to such convention issued in the same manner as is prescribed by the laws of said Territory regulating elections therein of members of the legislature. The convention shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of the delegates.

SEC. 3. That the delegates to the convention thus elected shall meet at the seat of government of said Territory on the second Tuesday after their election, excluding the day of election in case such day shall be Tuesday, and, after organization, shall declare on behalf of the people of said proposed State that they adopt the Constitution of the United States, whereupon the said convention shall be, and is hereby, authorized to form a constitution and State government for said proposed State.

The constitution shall be republican in form and make no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race, color, or sex, and not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence. And said convention shall provide in said constitution:

First. That perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship.

Second. That provisions shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools, which shall be open to all the children of said State and free from sectarian control.

Third. That the debts and liabilities of said Territory of Hawaii shall be assumed and paid by said State.

Fourth. That the property in the Territory of Hawaii set aside by Executive order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union is ceded to the United States, as more particularly provided in the next section of this Act.

Fifth. That authority is granted to and acknowledged in the United States to the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation, as provided by article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States, in all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land as are now owned by the United States and held for military, naval, or coast-guard purposes, whether title to such lands was acquired by cession and transfer to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii and set aside by Executive order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States, or acquired by the United States by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided*, That the State of Hawaii shall have the right to serve civil or criminal process within the said tracts or parcels of land in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed within the said State but outside of the said tracts or parcels of land; and the Legislative Assembly is authorized and directed to enact any law necessary or proper to give effect to this article.

Sixth. That, as a compact with the United States relating to the management and disposition of the Hawaiian home lands, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is adopted as a law of said State, subject to amendment or repeal only with the consent of the United States, and in no other manner: *Provided*, That (1) sections 202, 213, 219, 220, 222, 224, and 225 and other provisions relating to administration, and paragraph (2) of section 201, sections 206 and 212, and other provisions relating to the powers and duties of officers other than those charged with the administration of said Act, may be amended in the original constitution or in the manner required for ordinary State legislation, but the Hawaiian home-loan fund and the Hawaiian home-development fund shall not be reduced or impaired, and the encumbrances authorized to be placed on Hawaiian home lands by officers other than those charged with the administration of said act shall not be increased, except with the consent of the United States; (2) that any amendment to increase the benefits to lessees of Hawaiian home lands may be made in the original constitution or in the manner required for ordinary State legislation but the qualifications of lessees shall not be changed except with the consent of the United States; and (3) that all proceeds and income from Hawaiian home lands, shall be available to said State for use in accordance with the terms of said act.

Seventh. That the lands and other property belonging to citizens of the United States residing without said State shall never be taxed at a higher rate than the lands and other property belonging to residents thereof.

SEC. 4. (a) The State of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, shall retain all the lands and other public property title to which is in the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof, except as herein provided, and all such lands and other property shall remain and be the absolute property of the State of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, subject to the constitution and laws of said State: *Provided, however,* That any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by Executive Order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, shall be and become the property of the United States absolutely or subject to such limitations, as the case may be.

(b) The United States shall retain title to all the public lands and other public property (except as hereafter provided) for a period of 5 years after the enactment of this act. Such land and public property shall continue to be administered in accordance with the laws applicable thereto immediately prior to the admission of said State until otherwise provided by the Congress: *Provided,* That immediately after the enactment of this act an investigation and report shall be made by a joint committee composed of the members of the Committees on Public Lands of the Senate and of the House of Representatives upon the subject of the public lands and other property in Hawaii and the Congress shall thereafter make a final determination and disposition of the remaining public lands and other public property. In the event the Congress had made no other disposition thereof within said 5-year period, then title to all of the public lands and other public property undisposed of shall thereupon vest in the State of Hawaii absolutely: *Provided, however,* That any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by Executive Order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States or the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, shall be and become the property of the United States or the State of Hawaii or of such political subdivisions, as the case may be, absolutely or subject to such limitations, as the case may be.

(c) The State of Hawaii, upon its admission to the Union, shall be entitled to select, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue patents to said State, for 180,000 acres of public lands, as that term is defined in section 73 (a) of the Hawaiian Organic Act (42 Stat. 116, 48 U. S. C., sec. 663), within the boundaries of said State. The selection of such lands by the State of Hawaii shall be made and completed within 5 years from the admission of said State into the Union. The lands so selected shall be in lieu of any and all grants provided for new States by provisions of law other than this Act, and such grants shall not extend to the State of Hawaii.

(d) The lands patented to the State of Hawaii pursuant to the preceding subsection, together with the proceeds thereof and the income therefrom, shall be held by said State as a public trust for the support of the public schools and other public educational institutions, for the betterment of the conditions of native Hawaiians, as defined in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, for the development of farm and home ownership on as widespread a basis as possible, and for the making of public improvements. Such lands, proceeds, and income shall be managed and disposed of for one or more of the foregoing purposes in such manner as the constitution and laws of said State may provide, and their use for any other object shall constitute a breach of trust for which suit may be brought by the United States. The schools and other educational institutions supported, in whole or in part, out of such public trust shall forever remain under the exclusive control of said State; and no part of the proceeds or income from the lands patented under the preceding subsection shall be used for the support of any sectarian school, college, or university.

(e) Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union all laws of the United States reserving to the United States the free use or enjoyment of property hereinabove vested in the State of Hawaii or its political subdivisions, or the right to alter, amend, or repeal laws relating thereto are hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. That when said constitution shall be formed as aforesaid, the convention forming the same shall provide for the submission of said constitution, together with the ordinances of said convention requiring ratification, to the people of said Territory for ratification at an election which shall be held on a day named by said convention not earlier than sixty nor later than ninety days

after said convention adjourns, at which election the qualified voters of said Territory shall vote directly for or against said constitution, for or against any provisions thereof separately submitted, and for or against said ordinances. Persons possessing the qualifications entitling them to vote for delegates under this Act shall be entitled to vote on the ratification or rejection of said constitution, the provisions thereof separately submitted, and said ordinances, under such rules or regulations as said convention may have prescribed, not in conflict with this Act. The returns of said election shall be made by the election officers direct to the secretary of said Territory who, with the Governor and the chief justice of said Territory, shall constitute a canvassing board and they, or any two of them, shall meet at the city of Honolulu, on the third Monday after said election, and shall canvass the same.

The said canvassing board shall forthwith certify the result of said election to the Governor of said Territory, together with a statement of the votes cast upon the question of ratification or rejection of said constitution, also a statement of the votes cast for or against such provisions thereof as were separately submitted to the voters at said election, and for or against said ordinances. If a majority of the legal votes cast at said election shall reject the constitution, the Governor of said Territory shall, by proclamation, order the constitutional convention to reassemble at a date not later than twenty days after the receipt by said Governor of the documents showing the rejection of the constitution by the people, and thereafter a new constitution shall be framed and the same proceedings shall be taken in regard thereto in like manner as if said constitution were being originally prepared for submission and submitted to the people.

When said constitution shall have been duly ratified by the people of said Territory as aforesaid, a certified copy of the same, together with such provisions thereof as have been separately submitted and duly ratified, and such ordinances of the convention as have been duly ratified, shall be submitted to the President of the United States for approval, together with a statement of the votes cast upon said constitution, and upon any provisions thereof separately submitted, and upon said ordinances. And if the constitution of said proposed State is republican in form and makes no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race, color, or sex, and is not repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and if all of the provisions of this Act relating to the formation of said constitution and State government have been complied with, it shall be the duty of the President of the United States thereupon to approve said constitution, and the said separate provisions thereof and ordinances, and to certify his approval to the Governor of said Territory. Within thirty days after the receipt of said notification from the President of the United States, the Governor shall issue his proclamation for the election, as hereinafter provided, of officers for all elective offices provided for by the constitution and laws of said State, except those offices for which the constitutional convention, by ordinance duly ratified by the people, shall have made other temporary provisions, but the officers so to be elected shall in any event include two Senators and two Representatives in Congress. Until and unless otherwise required by ordinance of said convention duly ratified by the people, or by the constitution or laws of said State, said Representatives shall be elected at large: *Provided*, That if the President of the United States shall approve said constitution but shall disapprove any provision thereof separately voted upon by the people, or any ordinance of said convention, the same shall be certified to the Governor of said Territory, and said election shall be held and all further proceedings for the admission of said new State shall be the same as if the provisions and ordinances so disapproved had been rejected by the people. And if the President shall disapprove said constitution, such disapproval shall be certified to the Governor of said Territory, with the President's objections to the proposed constitution; the Governor thereupon by proclamation shall order the constitutional convention to reassemble at a date not later than twenty days after receipt of such notification and thereafter a new constitution shall be framed and the same proceedings shall be taken in regard thereto in like manner as if said constitution were being originally prepared for submission and submitted to the people.

SEC. 6. That said constitutional convention shall provide that in case of the ratification of said constitution by the people, and in case of the President of the United States approves the same, all as hereinbefore provided, an election, or primary and general elections, as may be required, shall be held at the time or times named in the proclamation of the Governor of said Territory provided for in the preceding section. Said election shall take place not earlier than sixty days nor later than ninety days after said proclamation by the Governor of said

Territory ordering the same, or if a primary election is to be held, then the primary election shall take place not earlier than sixty days nor later than ninety days after said proclamation by the Governor of said Territory, and the general election shall take place within forty days after the primary election. At such election or elections the officers required to be elected as provided in section 5, shall be chosen by the people. Such election or elections shall be held, and the qualifications of voters thereof shall be, as prescribed by said constitution and the laws of said State for the election of members of the State legislature, except as otherwise provided by ordinance of said constitutional convention duly ratified by the people. The returns thereof shall be made, canvassed, and certified in the same manner as in this Act prescribed with respect to the election for the ratification or rejection of said constitution, as hereinbefore provided. When said election of said officers above provided for shall be held and the returns thereof made, canvassed, and certified as hereinbefore provided, the Governor of the said Territory shall certify the result of said election, as canvassed and certified as herein provided, to the President of the United States, who thereupon shall immediately issue his proclamation announcing the result of said election so ascertained, and, upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States, the proposed State of Hawaii shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union by virtue of this Act, on an equal footing with the other States. Until the said State is so admitted into the Union, the persons holding legislative, executive, and judicial offices in or under or by authority of the government of said Territory, and the Delegate in Congress thereof, shall continue to discharge the duties of their respective offices. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States and the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the officers elected at said election, and qualified under the provisions of the constitution and laws of said State, shall proceed to exercise all the functions pertaining to their offices in or under or by authority of the government of said State, and officers not required to be elected at said initial election shall be selected or continued in office as provided by ordinances of the constitutional convention duly ratified by the people, or by the constitution and laws of said State. The Governor and secretary of said State shall certify the election of the Senators and Representatives in the manner required by law, and the said Senators and Representatives shall be entitled to be admitted to seats in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of other States in the Congress of the United States.

Sec. 7. Upon the admission of the proposed State of Hawaii into the Union the House of Representatives shall be composed of four hundred and thirty-seven Members until the expiration of the Eighty-second Congress, and shall thereafter be composed of four hundred and thirty-five Members.

Subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for apportioning Representatives in Congress among the several States by the equal proportions method", approved November 15, 1941 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, Supp. V, title 2 sec. 2b), is hereby amended, effective on the date of the admission of the proposed State of Hawaii into the Union, to read as follows:

"(a) Each State (other than Hawaii) shall be entitled, in the Seventy-eighth and in each Congress thereafter until the taking effect of a reapportionment under a subsequent statute or such section 22, as amended by this Act, to the number of Representatives shown in the statement transmitted to the Congress on January 8, 1941, based upon the method known as the method of equal proportions, no State to receive less than one Member; and the State of Hawaii shall be entitled to two Representatives from the time of its admission into the Union until the taking effect of such a reapportionment."

Sec. 8. That the sum of \$200,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for defraying the expenses of the elections provided for in this act and the expenses of the convention and for the payment of compensation to the delegates to said convention. The delegates shall receive for their services, in addition to mileage at the rate of 20 cents a mile each way, the sum of \$1,000 each, payable in four equal installments on and after the first, twentieth, fortieth, and sixtieth days of the convention, excluding Sundays and holidays. The disbursements of the money so appropriated shall be made by the Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii. The Territorial legislature is hereby authorized to appropriate such a sum as it may deem advisable for the payment of additional compensation to said delegates and for defraying their expenses and for such other purposes as it may deem necessary.

SEC. 9. That the State of Hawaii shall constitute a judicial district within the ninth judicial circuit, to be known as the district of Hawaii. To the United States district court hereby created two judges shall be appointed, and to it and to them all laws relating to United States district courts and district judges shall be applicable. The regular terms of the court shall be held at Honolulu on the second Monday in April and October, and the office of the clerk of court shall be kept at Honolulu.

SEC. 10. That in addition to its normal jurisdiction as a United States district court, the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii shall have also that jurisdiction heretofore conferred upon its predecessor by the Act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784, ch. 662).

SEC. 11. That in the manner prescribed by law there shall be appointed a clerk for the district court, a United States attorney, a United States marshal for the district, and such assistants, deputies, court officers, and clerical and other personnel as are provided for by the laws relating to district courts, judges, and judicial districts.

SEC. 12. No action, case, proceeding, or matter pending in any court of the Territory of Hawaii, or in the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii, shall abate by reason of the admission of said State into the Union, but the same shall be transferred to and proceeded with in such appropriate State courts as shall be established under the constitution to be thus formed, or in the District Court of the United States for the District of Hawaii, as the nature of the case may require. And no indictment, action, or proceedings shall abate by reason of any change in the courts, but shall be proceeded with in the State or United States courts according to the laws thereof, respectively. And the appropriate State courts and the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii shall be the successors of the courts of the Territory and the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii as to all cases arising within the limits embraced within the jurisdiction of such courts, respectively, with full power to proceed with the same, and award mesne or final process therein, and all the files, records, indictments, and proceedings relating to any such cases shall be transferred to such appropriate State courts and the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, respectively, and the same shall be proceeded with therein in due course of law.

All civil causes of action and all criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed prior to the admission of said State, but as to which no suit, action, or prosecution shall be pending at the date of such admission, shall be subject to prosecution in the appropriate State courts or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii in like manner, to the same extent, and with like right of appellate review, as if said State had been created and said courts had been established prior to the accrual of such causes of action or the commission of such offenses; and such of said criminal offenses as shall have been committed against the laws of the Territory shall be tried and punished by the appropriate courts of said State, and such as shall have been committed against the laws of the United States shall be tried and punished in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii.

SEC. 13. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of final decisions of the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii or the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii in any case finally decided prior to admission of said State into the Union, whether or not an appeal therefrom shall have been perfected prior to such admission, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided prior to admission of said State into the Union, and any mandate issued subsequent to the admission of said State shall be to the District Court of the United States for the District of Hawaii or a court of the State, as may be appropriate. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of all judgments and decrees of the District Court of the United States for the District of Hawaii as successor to the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii, and of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawaii as successor to the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, in any case pending at the time of admission of said State into the Union, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided in any case arising subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union.

SEC. 14. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, paragraph "First" of subsection (a) of section 128 of the Judicial Code, as

amended (28 U. S. C. A., sec. 225), shall apply to the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii and paragraph "Second" thereof shall be inapplicable.

SEC. 15. All laws in force in the Territory of Hawaii at the time of its admission into the Union shall continue in force in the State of Hawaii, except as modified or changed by this Act or by the constitution of the State or by ordinance of the constitutional convention duly ratified by the people, and shall be subject to repeal or amendment by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, except as hereinbefore provided with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended; and the laws of the United States shall have the same force and effect within the said State as elsewhere within the United States.

SEC. 16. Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall continue to have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over the area which may then or thereafter be included in Hawaii National Park, saving, however, to the State of Hawaii the same rights as are reserved to the Territory of Hawaii by section 1 of the Act of April 19, 1930 (46 Stat. 227), and saving, further, to persons then or thereafter residing within such area the right to vote at all elections held within the political subdivisions where they respectively reside. Upon the admission of said State all references to the Territory of Hawaii in said Act or in other laws relating to Hawaii National Park shall be deemed to refer to the State of Hawaii.

SEC. 17. All Acts or parts of Acts in conflict with the provisions of this Act, whether passed by the legislature of said Territory or by Congress, are hereby repealed.

[S. 1782, 81st Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the inhabitants of all that part of the area of the United States now constituting the Territory of Hawaii, as at present described, may become the State of Hawaii, as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. That all citizens of the United States who have the qualifications for voters for representatives to the Territorial legislature are hereby authorized to vote for and choose delegates to form a convention in said Territory.

Such delegates shall possess the qualifications of such electors, and members of the Territorial legislature shall be eligible to election as such delegates, and with no resulting disqualification as such members of the Territorial legislature the provisions of sections 16 and 17 of the Hawaiian Organic Act to the contrary notwithstanding.

The aforesaid convention shall consist of sixty-three delegates apportioned among the counties and city and county, and the representative districts within the limits of the proposed State on the following basis:

County of Hawaii, at large, four delegates;

First representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7; precincts 8, 9, 10, and 11; precincts 12, 13, and 14; precincts 15, 16, 30, and 17; precincts 18, 19, 20, 21, 31, and 22; precincts 23, 32, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29;

Second representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 16; precincts 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15.

County of Maui, at large, three delegates;

Third representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5; precincts 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11; precincts 9, 12, 13, and 28; precincts 14, 15, 16, and 17; precincts 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27; precincts 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34;

City and county of Honolulu, hereinafter included in the word "county", at large, twelve delegates;

Fourth representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 24, 25, and 26; precincts 19, 20, 21, and 22; precincts 15 and 16; precincts 12, 17, and 32; precincts 11 and 18; precincts 13 and 14; precincts 6 and 36; precincts 7 and 8; precincts 9 and 10; precincts 34 and 31; precincts 5 and 35; precincts 4, 30, and 33; precincts 1 and 2; precincts 3 and 29;

Fifth representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 5, 7, 30, and 31; precincts 6, 29, 8, and 9; precincts 10, 11, 32,

and 26; precincts 12, 33, and 13; precincts 14, 15, 16, and 17; precincts 18 and 19; precincts 22, 23, 28, and 27;

Fourth and fifth representative districts, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precinct 28, fourth district, and precincts 1, 2, 3, and 4, fifth district; precinct 27, fourth district, and precincts 20 and 21, fifth district; precinct 23, fourth district, and precincts 24 and 25, fifth district;

County of Kauai, at large, two delegates;

Sixth representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 1, 2, 3, and 4; precincts 5 and 6; precincts 8, 9, 10, and 11; and one delegate from precinct 7.

The precincts herein mentioned are as they existed on November 5, 1946.

The Governor of said Territory shall, within thirty days after the approval of this Act, issue a proclamation ordering a primary election for the nomination of candidates for the offices of the delegates aforesaid on a day designated by him in said proclamation, not earlier than sixty nor later than ninety days after the approval of this Act; and a final election not earlier than thirty, nor later than forty, days after such primary election.

The name of no candidate shall be printed upon any official ballot to be used at such primary election unless at least twenty days prior to such primary a nomination paper shall have been filed in the office of the secretary of the Territory in his behalf, nominating him as a candidate for delegate from the county concerned, or from a precinct or combination of precincts in a representative district or districts, as may be the case, and signed by not less than twenty-five qualified electors of the district concerned, and the sum of \$25 shall have been paid to the secretary of the Territory, which fee shall be a Territorial realization.

Each person shall be a qualified elector of the county or precinct or combination of precincts in which he is a candidate for delegate.

No such nomination paper shall contain any reference to or designation of any political party, and the ballots used at such election shall be nonpartisan and shall not contain any reference to or designation of the political party or affiliation of any candidate. The names of the candidates in each county and of the candidates in the precinct or combination of precincts of the representative districts shall be on separate ballots.

The ballots submitted to the voters of each county, precinct, or combination of precincts shall separately set forth the names of candidates for delegates from such county or precinct or combinations of precincts, and shall instruct the voters that the number of candidates to be voted for by such voter shall not exceed the number of delegates to which the county, precinct, or combination of precincts is entitled, or the number of such delegates remaining to be elected, as the case may be, which number shall be stated. The ballots in each county shall also instruct the voters that the number of candidates to be voted for by each voter shall not be less than a majority of the number of delegates which such county is entitled to elect at the particular election, primary or final, as the case may be, and the number constituting such a majority shall be stated. At such primary election any candidate in a precinct or combination of precincts who receives a majority of the votes of the voters voting therein shall be declared elected, and any candidate in a county who receives such a majority of votes, not exceeding the number of delegates to be elected from each county, shall likewise be declared elected. The names of the remaining candidates receiving the highest number of votes, not exceeding two from each precinct or combination of precincts, or double the number of delegates to be elected at large from each county above the number already declared elected as aforesaid, if any, shall be placed on the ballot for the final election.

No ballot in a county ticket shall be counted at either the primary election or the final election unless the number of candidates voted for by the voter is at least equal to a majority of the number of delegates which the county concerned was entitled to elect at such election.

Only those nominated at such primary election shall be eligible to run for delegate at such final election. The ballots for such final election shall be in substantially the same form as those for the primary election, and the requirements of this Act as to such primary election shall, as far as appropriate, apply to such final election. In case of a tie vote at either the primary or final election, the candidates so tied shall draw lots under the supervision of the county clerk to determine which of them shall be nominated or elected as the case may be.

In case any office of delegate has not been filled or shall become vacant for any reason the Governor shall appoint an elector of the same county, precinct, or combination of precincts, to fill such vacancy.

Except as otherwise specifically provided by this Act, the primary and final elections for such delegates shall be conducted the returns made, the results ascertained, and the certificates of persons elected to such convention issued in the same manner as is prescribed by the laws of said Territory regulating elections therein of members of the legislature. The convention shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of the delegates.

Sec. 3. That the delegates to the convention thus elected shall meet at the seat of government of said Territory on the second Tuesday after this election, excluding the day of election in case such day shall be Tuesday, and, after organization, shall declare on behalf of the people of said proposed State that they adopt the Constitution of the United States, whereupon the said convention shall be, and is hereby, authorized to form a constitution and State government for said proposed State.

The constitution shall be republican in form and make no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race, color, or sex, and not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence. And said convention shall provide in said constitution:

First. That perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship.

Second. That provisions shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools, which shall be open to all the children of said State and free from sectarian control.

Third. That the debts and liabilities of said Territory of Hawaii shall be assumed and paid by said State.

Fourth. That the property in the Territory of Hawaii set aside by Executive order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union is ceded to the United States, as more particularly provided in the next section of this Act.

Fifth. That authority is granted to and acknowledged in the United States to the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation, as provided by article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States, in all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land as are now owned by the United States and held for military, naval, or coast-guard purposes, whether title to such lands was acquired by cession and transfer to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii and set aside by Executive order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States, or acquired by the United States by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided*, That the State of Hawaii shall have the right to serve civil or criminal process within the said tracts or parcels of land in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed within the said State but outside of the said tracts or parcels of land; and the Legislative Assembly is authorized and directed to enact any law necessary or proper to give effect to this article.

Sixth. That, as a compact with the United States relating to the management and disposition of the Hawaiian home lands, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is adopted as a law of said State, subject to amendment or repeal only with the consent of the United States, and in no other manner: *Provided*, That (1) sections 202, 213, 219, 220, 222, 224, and 225 and other provisions relating to administration, and paragraph (2) of section 204, sections 206 and 212, and other provisions relating to the powers and duties of officers other than those charged with the administration of said Act, may be amended in the original constitution or in the manner required for ordinary State legislation, but the Hawaiian home-loan fund and the Hawaiian home-development fund shall not be reduced or impaired, and the encumbrances authorized to be placed on Hawaiian home lands by officers other than those charged with the administration of said Act shall not be increased, except with the consent of the United States; (2) that any amendment to increase the benefits to lessees of Hawaiian home lands may be made in the original constitution or in the manner required for ordinary State legislation but the qualifications of lessees shall not be changed except with the consent of the United States; and (3) that all proceeds and income from Hawaiian home lands, shall be available to said State for use in accordance with the terms of said Act.

Seventh. That the lands and other property belonging to citizens of the United States residing without said State shall never be taxed at a higher rate than the lands and other property belonging to residents thereof.

SEC. 4. (a) The State of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, shall retain all the lands and other public property title to which is in the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof, except as herein provided, and all such lands and other property shall remain and be the absolute property of the State of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, subject to the constitution and laws of said State: *Provided, however*, That any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by Executive order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, shall be and become the property of the United States absolutely or subject to such limitations, as the case may be.

(b) The United States shall retain title to all the public lands and other public property (except as hereafter provided) for a period of five years after the enactment of this Act. Such land and public property shall continue to be administered in accordance with the laws applicable thereto immediately prior to the admission of said State until otherwise provided by the Congress: *Provided*, That immediately after the enactment of this Act an investigation and report shall be made by a joint committee composed of the members of the Committees on Public Lands of the Senate and of the House of Representatives upon the subject of the public lands and other property in Hawaii, and the Congress shall thereafter make a final determination and disposition of the remaining public lands and other public property. In the event the Congress has made no other disposition thereof within said five-year period, then title to all of the public lands and other public property undisposed of shall thereupon vest in the State of Hawaii absolutely: *Provided, however*, That any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by Executive order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States or the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, shall be and become the property of the United States or the State of Hawaii or of such political subdivision, as the case may be, absolutely or subject to such limitations, as the case may be.

(c) The State of Hawaii, upon its admission to the Union, shall be entitled to select, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue patents to said State for, one hundred and eighty thousand acres of public lands, as that term is defined in section 73 (a) of the Hawaiian Organic Act (42 Stat. 116, 48 U. S. C., sec. 663), within the boundaries of said State. The selection of such lands by the State of Hawaii shall be made and completed within five years from the admission of said State into the Union. The lands so selected shall be in lieu of any and all grants provided for new States by provisions of law other than this Act, and such grants shall not extend to the State of Hawaii.

(d) The lands patented to the State of Hawaii pursuant to the preceding subsection, together with the proceeds thereof and the income therefrom, shall be held by said State as a public trust for the support of the public schools and other public educational institutions, for the betterment of the conditions of native Hawaiians, as defined in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, for the development of farm and home ownership on as widespread a basis as possible, and for the making of public improvements. Such lands, proceeds, and income shall be managed and disposed of for one or more of the foregoing purposes in such manner as the constitution and laws of said State may provide, and their use for any other object shall constitute a breach of trust for which suit may be brought by the United States. The schools and other educational institutions supported, in whole or in part, out of such public trust shall forever remain under the exclusive control of said State; and no part of the proceeds or income from the lands patented under the preceding subsection shall be used for the support of any sectarian school, college, or university.

(e) Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union all laws of the United States reserving to the United States the free use or enjoyment of property herein-above vested in the State of Hawaii or its political subdivisions, or the right to alter, amend, or repeal laws relating thereto, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. That when said constitution shall be formed as aforesaid, the convention forming the same shall provide for the submission of said constitution, together with the ordinances of said convention requiring ratification, to the people of said Territory for ratification at an election which shall be held on a day named by said convention not earlier than sixty nor later than ninety days after said convention adjourns, at which election the qualified voters of said Territory shall vote directly for or against said constitution, for or against any provisions thereof separately submitted, and for or against said ordinances. Persons possessing the qualifications entitling them to vote or delegates under this Act shall be entitled to vote on the ratification or rejection of said constitution, the provisions thereof separately submitted, and said ordinances, under such rules or regulations as said convention may have prescribed, not in conflict with this Act. The returns of said election shall be made by the election officers direct to the secretary of said Territory who, with the Governor and the chief justice of said Territory, shall constitute a canvassing board and they, or any two of them, shall meet at the city of Honolulu, on the third Monday after said election, and shall canvass the same.

The said canvassing board shall forthwith certify the result of said election to the Governor of said Territory, together with a statement of the votes cast upon the question of ratification or rejection of said constitution, also a statement of the votes cast for or against such provisions thereof as were separately submitted to the voters at said election, and for or against said ordinances. If a majority of the legal votes cast at said election shall reject the constitution, the Governor of said Territory shall, by proclamation, order the constitutional convention to reassemble at a date not later than twenty days after the receipt by said Governor of the documents showing the rejection of the constitution by the people, and thereafter a new constitution shall be framed and the same proceedings shall be taken in regard thereto in like manner as if said constitution were being originally prepared for submission and submitted to the people.

When said constitution shall have been duly ratified by the people of said Territory, as aforesaid, a certified copy of the same, together with such provisions thereof as have been separately submitted and duly ratified, and such ordinances of the convention as have been duly ratified, shall be submitted to the President of the United States for approval, together with a statement of the votes cast upon said constitution, and upon any provisions thereof separately submitted, and upon said ordinances. And if the constitution of said proposed State is republican in form and makes no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race, color, or sex, and is not repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and if all of the provisions of this Act relating to the formation of said constitution and State government have been complied with, it shall be the duty of the President of the United States thereupon to approve said constitution, and the said separate provisions thereof and ordinances, and to certify his approval to the Governor of said Territory. Within thirty days after the receipt of said notification from the President of the United States, the Governor shall issue his proclamation for the election, as hereinafter provided, of officers for all elective offices provided for by the constitution and laws of said State, except those offices for which the constitutional convention, by ordinance duly ratified by the people, shall have made other temporary provisions, but the officers so to be elected shall in any event include two Senators and two Representatives in Congress. Until and unless otherwise required by ordinance of said convention duly ratified by the people, or by the constitution or laws of said State, said Representatives shall be elected at large: *Provided*, That if the President of the United States shall approve said constitution but shall disapprove any provision thereof separately voted upon by the people, or any ordinance of said convention, the same shall be certified to the Governor of said Territory, and said election shall be held and all further proceedings for the admission of said new State shall be the same as if the provisions and ordinances so disapproved had been rejected by the people. And if the President shall disapprove said constitution, such disapproval shall be certified to the Governor of said Territory, with the President's objections to the proposed constitution; the Governor thereupon by proclamation shall order the constitutional convention to reassemble at a date not later than twenty days after receipt of such notification and thereafter a new constitution shall be framed and the same proceedings shall be taken in regard thereto in like manner as if said constitution were being originally prepared for submission and submitted to the people.

SEC. 6. That said constitutional convention shall provide that in case of the ratification of said constitution by the people, and in case the President of the United States approves the same, all as hereinbefore provided, an election, or primary and general elections, as may be required, shall be held at the time or times named in the proclamation of the Governor of said Territory provided for in the preceding section. Said election shall take place not earlier than sixty days nor later than ninety days after said proclamation by the Governor of said Territory ordering the same, or if a primary election is to be held, then the primary election shall take place not earlier than sixty days nor later than ninety days after said proclamation by the Governor of said Territory, and the general election shall take place within forty days after the primary election. At such election or elections the officers required to be elected as provided in section 5, shall be chosen by the people. Such election or elections shall be held, and the qualifications of voters thereat shall be, as prescribed by said constitution and the laws of said State for the election of members of the State legislature, except as otherwise provided by ordinance of said constitutional convention duly ratified by the people. The returns thereof shall be made, canvassed, and certified in the same manner as in this Act prescribed with respect to the election for the ratification or rejection of said constitution, as hereinbefore provided. When said election of said officers above provided for shall be held and the returns thereof made, canvassed, and certified as hereinbefore provided, the Governor of the said Territory shall certify the results of said election, as canvassed and certified as herein provided, to the President of the United States, who thereupon shall immediately issue his proclamation announcing the result of said election so ascertained, and, upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States, the proposed State of Hawaii shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union by virtue of this Act, on an equal footing with the other States. Until the said State is so admitted into the Union, the persons holding legislative, executive, and judicial offices in or under or by authority of the government of said Territory, and the Delegate in Congress thereof, shall continue to discharge the duties of their respective offices. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States and the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the officers elected at said election, and qualified under the provisions of the constitution and laws of said State, shall proceed to exercise all the functions pertaining to their offices in or under or by authority of the government of said State, and officers not required to be elected at said initial election shall be selected or continued in office as provided by ordinances of the constitutional convention duly ratified by the people, or by the constitution and laws of said State. The Governor and secretary of said State shall certify the election of the Senators and Representatives in the manner required by law, and the said Senators and Representatives shall be entitled to be admitted to seats in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of other States in the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 7. Upon the admission of the proposed State of Hawaii into the Union the House of Representatives shall be composed of four hundred and thirty-seven Members until the expiration of the Eighty-second Congress, and shall thereafter be composed of four hundred and thirty-five Members.

Subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for apportioning Representatives in Congress among the several States by the equal-proportions method," approved November 15, 1941 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, Supp. V, title 2, sec. 2b), is hereby amended, effective on the date of the admission of the proposed State of Hawaii into the Union, to read as follows:

"(a) Each State (other than Hawaii) shall be entitled in the Seventy-eighth and in each Congress thereafter until the taking effect of a reapportionment under a subsequent statute or such section 22, as amended by this Act, to the number of Representatives shown in the statement transmitted to the Congress on January 8, 1941, based upon the method known as the method of equal proportions, no State to receive less than one Member; and the State of Hawaii shall be entitled to two Representatives from the time of its admission into the Union until the taking effect of such a reapportionment."

SEC. 8. That the sum of \$200,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for defraying the expenses of the elections provided for in this Act and the expenses of the convention and for the payment of compensation to the delegates to said convention. The delegates shall receive for their services, in addition to mileage at the rate of 20 cents a mile each way, the sum

of \$1,000 each, payable in four equal installments on and after the first, twentieth, fortieth, and sixtieth days of the convention, excluding Sundays and holidays. The disbursements of the money so appropriated shall be made by the Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii. The Territorial legislature is hereby authorized to appropriate such sum as it may deem advisable for the payment of additional compensation to said delegates and for defraying their expenses and for such other purposes as it may deem necessary.

SEC. 9. That the State of Hawaii shall constitute a judicial district within the ninth judicial circuit, to be known as the district of Hawaii. To the United States district court hereby created two judges shall be appointed, and to it and to them all laws relating to United States district courts and district judges shall be applicable. The regular terms of the court shall be held at Honolulu on the second Monday in April and October, and the office of the clerk of court shall be kept at Honolulu.

SEC. 10. That in addition to its normal jurisdiction as a United States district court, the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii shall have also that jurisdiction heretofore conferred upon its predecessor by the Act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784, ch. 662).

SEC. 11. That in the manner prescribed by law there shall be appointed a clerk for the district court, a United States attorney, a United States marshal for the district, and such assistants, deputies, court officers, and clerical and other personnel as are provided for by the laws relating to district courts, judges, and judicial districts.

SEC. 12. No action, case, proceeding, or matter pending in any court of the Territory of Hawaii, or in the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii, shall abate by reason of the admission of said State into the Union, but the same shall be transferred to and proceed with in such appropriate State courts as shall be established under the constitution to be thus formed, or in the District Court of the United States for the District of Hawaii, as the nature of the case may require. And no indictment, action, or proceedings shall abate by reason of any change in the courts, but shall be proceeded with in the State or United States courts according to the laws thereof, respectively. And the appropriate State courts and the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii shall be the successors of the courts of the Territory and the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii as to all cases arising within the limits embraced within the jurisdiction of such courts, respectively, with full power to proceed with the same, and award mesne or final process therein, and all the files, records, indictments, and proceedings relating to any such cases shall be transferred to such appropriate State courts and the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, respectively, and the same shall be proceeded with therein in due course of law.

All civil causes of action and all criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed prior to the admission of said State, but as to which no suit, action, or prosecution shall be pending at the date of such admission, shall be subject to prosecution in the appropriate State courts or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii in like manner, to the same extent, and with like right of appellate review, as if said State had been created and said courts had been established prior to the accrual of such causes of action or the commission of such offenses; and such of said criminal offenses as shall have been committed against the laws of the Territory shall be tried and punished by the appropriate courts of said State, and such as shall have been committed against the laws of the United States shall be tried and punished in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii.

SEC. 13. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of final decisions of the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii or the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii in any case finally decided prior to admission of said State into the Union, whether or not an appeal therefrom shall have been perfected prior to such admission, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided prior to admission of said State into the Union, and any mandate issued subsequent to the admission of said State shall be to the District Court of the United States for the District of Hawaii or a court of the State, as may be appropriate. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of all judgments and decrees of the District Court of the United States for the District of Hawaii as successor to the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii, and of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawaii as successor to the Supreme Court of the Ter-

ritory of Hawaii, in any case pending at the time of admission of said State into the Union, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided in any case arising subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union.

SEC. 14. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, paragraph "First" of subsection (a) of section 128 of the Judicial Code, as amended (28 U. S. C. A., sec. 225), shall apply to the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii and paragraph "Second" thereof shall be inapplicable.

SEC. 15. All laws in force in the Territory of Hawaii at the time of its admission into the Union shall continue in force in the State of Hawaii, except as modified or changed by this Act or by the constitution of the State or by ordinance of the constitutional convention duly ratified by the people, and shall be subject to repeal or amendment by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, except as hereinbefore provided with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended; and the laws of the United States shall have the same force and effect within the said State as elsewhere within the United States.

SEC. 16. Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall continue to have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over the area which may then or thereafter be included in Hawaii National Park, saving, however, to the State of Hawaii the same rights as are reserved to the Territory of Hawaii by section 1 of the Act of April 19, 1930 (46 Stat. 227), and saving, further, to persons then or thereafter residing within such area the right to vote at all elections held within the political subdivisions where they respectively reside. Upon the admission of said State all references to the Territory of Hawaii in said Act or in other laws relating to Hawaii National Park shall be deemed to refer to the State of Hawaii.

SEC. 17. All Acts or parts of Acts in conflict with the provisions of this Act, whether passed by the legislature of said Territory or by Congress, are hereby repealed.

The CHAIRMAN. There will also be included in the record the formal letter from the Department of the Interior reporting on the bill, and formal letters which have been received likewise from the State Department, the Department of Defense, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 28, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington 25, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Reference is made to H. R. 49, a bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, which was passed by the House of Representatives on March 7, and which is now pending before your committee.

I strongly urge the enactment of H. R. 49. I suggest, however, for the consideration of your committee certain amendments which are contained in the attached list.

That the people of Hawaii now desire statehood is amply demonstrated by the fact that at a plebiscite in 1940 they voted 2 to 1 in favor of admission to the Union; there is little doubt that the odds would be even more heavily weighted if a poll were to be taken now. Mainland sentiment, too, is overwhelmingly in favor of statehood. The reasons for this sentiment in favor of statehood for Hawaii lie in a background of close political, economic, and social ties between the people of that Territory and the people of the continental United States. Hawaii, it must be remembered, voluntarily relinquished its status as a sovereign nation to enter into the American Commonwealth. Today, after over half a century of active participation in the broader life of the whole American community, Hawaii is truly an integral part of our Nation, devoted to the democratic ideals and institutions of the United States. Modern transportation facilities have ended even the physical isolation of the Territory.

The eminent qualification of the people of Hawaii to govern themselves within the framework of the Union has been already amply evidenced by the mass of

progressive and intelligent laws on their statute books, their advanced school system, and the wise management of their fiscal affairs. Hawaii has contributed, and will continue to contribute, to the national welfare in a manner of which we may all be proud. Hawaii imports from the continental United States most of its consumer goods, and exports to the mainland the greater part of the products of its two major industries, sugar and pineapple. The commerce of Hawaii with the mainland exceeds that between the mainland and but a few foreign countries. Hawaii has consistently paid into the national Treasury a considerably larger amount than the Federal Government has spent in the Territory, exclusive of national defense expenditures.

I have mentioned but a few of the many points that could be made in support of the case of Hawaii's becoming one of the United States. For a comprehensive and convincing demonstration of the Territory's present ability to assume the responsibilities of a statehood, I refer you to the splendid record compiled by the subcommittee of the House Committee on Territories which held hearings on statehood in Hawaii during January 1946. Every possible aspect of territorial life was examined and considered by the subcommittee. Hearings were held on the principal island and opportunities were afforded all interested persons, whether in favor of or opposed to statehood, to be heard. On the basis of the hearings and exhibits, the subcommittee's report found that the total of Federal internal-revenue tax collections made in the Territory during 1944 and 1945 exceeded that of several States; that the gross assessed value of real property in Hawaii is higher than that of any State at the time of admission, with one exception; that illiteracy among native-born citizens is almost nonexistent; and that Hawaii, despite its polyracial composition, is essentially American in thought, purpose, and action. The report also found that, notwithstanding the many racial groups, such evidence of bloc voting as exists indicates that the practice has not assumed and is not likely to assume serious proportions; and that the Hawaiians are very politically conscious, 85.03 percent of the registered voters having voted in the 1944 election. In the 1948 election, this figure increased to 86.5 percent. The subcommittee concluded that the mixed racial complexion of Hawaii should not be considered an obstacle to statehood; that the people of Hawaii have shown themselves capable of self-government; that though there is economic dominance by the Big Five of a great portion of Hawaii's economy, it has not prevented establishment of many varied businesses nor the passage of progressive labor, educational, and social legislation; that a majority of the people in the Territory are in favor of immediate statehood; and that no organized opposition appeared.

On the basis of this extensive investigation, the House subcommittee recommended that immediate consideration be given to legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood. I unequivocally endorse that recommendation.

The Territorial legislature of Hawaii has enacted legislation (Act 334, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949), to expedite local consideration of a constitutional framework for the proposed State of Hawaii. Section 2 of that legislation provides for the election of delegates to a constitutional convention, and section 3 authorizes the convention to draft a proposed constitution. The delegates elected by the people of Hawaii pursuant to this legislation convened in Honolulu on April 4, 1950, and proceed to initiate work on a constitution for the proposed State. These Territorial measures render unnecessary those provisions of the bill which provide for the election and organization of a constitutional convention. In order to take cognizance of the existing situation, proposed amendments are suggested which would adapt the provisions of the bill to that situation.

For many years the Department of the Interior has been in a position to witness the rapid development of Hawaii's high standards of government in all matters affecting local welfare. This Department can also testify without reservation to the steadfast loyalty and patriotic vigilance of Hawaii's citizens during the critical and trying days of World War II. There is no question in my mind, by any standard of judgment, these citizens of the United States have demonstrated their readiness for self-government as a State, and for full representation in the national Government.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that the objective of this proposed legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 49, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, AS PASSED BY THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

1. A. Page 1, line 7, to page 7, line 10: Strike out all of section 2.

B. Page 7, lines 11-19: Strike out the first paragraph of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. Sections 2 and 3 of the Act of the Territorial legislature of Hawaii, entitled 'An Act to provide for a constitutional convention, the adoption of a State constitution, and the forwarding of the same to the Congress of the United States, and appropriating money therefor,' approved May 20, 1949 (Act. 334, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949) which sections provide for the election and organization of a constitutional convention and the forming of a constitution and State government for the proposed State of Hawaii, are hereby ratified. In order that the constitutional convention so elected and organized may have an opportunity to consider whether any changes in the constitution and State government so formed are needed by reason of the enactment of this Act, the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, within 20 days after the approval of this Act, may, and upon petition by at least one-fifth of the delegates of said convention shall, issue a proclamation directing said convention to reconvene, if it has previously adjourned, on the day designated by such proclamation, which day shall not be later than 10 days after the issuance of such proclamation."

C. Page 10, line 10: Renumber "SEC. 4" as "SEC. 3", and renumber all succeeding sections accordingly.

D. Page 14, lines 4-10: Strike out the following: "the convention forming the same shall provide for the submission of said constitution, together with the ordinances of said convention requiring ratification, to the people of said Territory for ratification at an election which shall be held on a day named by said convention not earlier than sixty nor later than ninety days after said convention adjourns, at which" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the said constitution, together with the ordinances of said convention requiring ratification, shall be submitted to the people of said Territory for ratification, by a majority of the legal votes cast, at an election to be held on a day designated by proclamation of the Governor of said Territory. Such proclamation shall be issued within 30 days after the approval of this Act if said convention has adjourned prior to the approval of this Act and is not reconvened pursuant to section 2 of this Act, or within 30 days after the final adjournment of said convention if it is still in session at the time of the approval of this Act or is subsequently reconvened, and the day designated therein for the holding of said election shall be not earlier than 60 nor later than 90 days after the issuance of said proclamation. At such".

E. Page 14, line 14: Strike out the words "this Act" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "section 2 of the Act of the Territorial legislature of Hawaii approved May 20, 1949 (Act 334, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949)".

F. Page 18, line 8: Strike out the figure "5" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "4".

The Territorial legislature of Hawaii has enacted legislation (Act 334, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949) to expedite local consideration of a constitutional framework for the proposed State of Hawaii. Section 2 of that legislation provides for the election of delegates to a constitutional convention, and section 3 authorizes the convention to draft a proposed constitution. The delegates elected by the people of Hawaii pursuant to this legislation convened in Honolulu on April 4, 1950, and proceeded to initiate work on a constitution for the proposed State. These Territorial measures render unnecessary those provisions of the bill which provide for the election and organization of a constitutional convention.

The proposed amendments would take cognizance of the existing situation, and would adapt the provisions of the bill to that situation. Item A would delete that portion of the bill which provides for the establishment of a constitutional convention, since such a convention has already been chosen by the people of Hawaii. Item B would ratify the action of the Territorial legislature in authorizing the election of delegates to the convention and in authorizing the convention to form a proposed constitution. This item also grants permission for the reconvening of the constitutional convention in the event it has concluded its deliberations prior to the enactment of the bill. By so doing, the convention would be afforded an appropriate opportunity for reconsideration of the proposed constitution in the light of the requirements of the bill, as finally enacted. Item C would make the changes in section numbers which would be necessitated by the deletion of

section 2, relating to the election of delegates to the constitutional convention. Item D would amend the provisions of the bill dealing with the calling of an election to ratify the proposed convention, so as to conform these provisions to the changed timing and pattern of submission necessitated by the existing situation. Items E and F would make minor adjustments related to the foregoing matters.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
April 7, 1950.

Hon. DEAN C. ACHESON,
*The Secretary of State,
State Department, Washington 25, D. C.*

MY DEAR SECRETARY: As you doubtless are aware, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has before it two bills, H. R. 331 and H. R. 49, which would admit the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, respectively, into the Federal Union as States. In connection with its consideration of this proposed legislation, the committee requires authoritative information from the Department of State as to what effect, if any, extension of statehood to these Territories would have upon the foreign relations of the United States.

Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii presents new and different problems from those that have been encountered up to the present in the admission of States, since both areas are noncontiguous to the United States. Also, in each there are large racial groups, comparatively, whose education and cultural standards differ markedly from those of the United States and who have little familiarity with our traditions, our political institutions, and our responsibilities.

It is recalled that certain representatives of the Soviet Union are reported to have made references to the treaty by which Alaska was purchased and to have indicated some possible interest in the future return of the Territory to Russian sovereignty. It is noted that western Alaska and eastern Siberia are extremely close, geographically.

Hearings on the Alaska bill are scheduled to open on April 24 and those on Hawaii on May 1. Would you be good enough to have a qualified officer of the State Department ready to give the committee factual information and the Department's views on the effects of the inclusion within the United States, politically speaking, of these strategic, noncontiguous areas with their diverse population elements? If you deem it desirable, the State Department can be heard in executive session, and the facts and opinions presented will not be made public.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, *Chairman.*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1950.

The Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate.*

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: This is to acknowledge your letter of April 7 addressed to Secretary Acheson informing him of the hearings on the Alaska and Hawaii bills which are scheduled to open on April 24, and May 1, respectively, and inviting the Department to have a qualified officer ready to give the committee factual information and the Department's views on the possible effects of the inclusion of these Territories within the United States.

When similar proposals were before the Senate last year, you were good enough to invite the views of the Department, which were furnished to you in letters dated July 7 and June 29, 1949. The views of the Department remain as then stated. The Department perceives no objection to the provisions of these bills from the standpoint of the foreign policy of the United States and considers that the admission of these Territories to the Union would be in conformity with the traditional policy of the United States toward the peoples of Territories under its administration who have not yet become fully self-governing. It continues to feel that favorable action on these bills by the Congress would be an act in fulfillment of the obligation assumed by the United States in accepting the declaration regarding non-self-governing territories set out in chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and would thus serve to support American foreign policy and strengthen the position of the United States in international affairs.

With reference to the final paragraph of your letter, the Department is glad to accept your invitation and will have a qualified officer ready to give the committee such factual information as the committee may wish to have insofar as the Department of State is concerned.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. McFALL,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 29, 1949.

The Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: On May 11, 1949, you transmitted to the Department of State for its study and report two bills, S. 156 and S. 1782, to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The Department of State has examined these bills carefully and, from the standpoint of foreign policy, does not perceive any objection to the provisions contained therein. On the general question, it is the view of the Department that action by the Congress enabling the people of Hawaii to fulfill their expressed aspiration for statehood would be in conformity with the traditional policy of the United States toward the peoples of Territories under its administration who have not yet become fully self-governing.

The Department also considers that such action by the Congress would be an act in fulfillment of the obligation assumed by the United States in accepting the declaration regarding non-self-governing territories set out in chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and would thus serve to support American foreign policy and strengthen the position of the United States in international affairs.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the objectives of these proposals are in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST A. GROSS,
Assistant Secretary.
(For the Secretary of State).

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
March 30, 1950.

Hon. LOUIS JOHNSON,
The Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you doubtless are aware, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has before it two bills, H. R. 331 and H. R. 49, which would admit the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, respectively, into the Federal Union as States. In connection with its consideration of this proposed legislation, the committee requires authoritative information from the Department of Defense as to the advantages, if any, from a point of view of national defense, of extending statehood to these Territories. Specifically, would statehood for Alaska and Hawaii give greater strength to our military position in those areas than does the present Territorial organization of the local government?

Hearings on the Alaska bill are scheduled to start April 24 and those on Hawaii on May 1. Would you be good enough to have a qualified member of the Defense Department ready to give the committee factual information with respect to the relative advantages and disadvantages of statehood for the defense of each of these Territories at these hearings? If you deem it desirable, the Defense Department can be heard in executive session, and any statements made at the time will not be made public.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, *Chairman.*

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, April 18, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: This letter is further in response to your communication of March 30, 1950, in which you make reference to two bills, H. R. 331 and H. R. 49, which, if enacted, would admit the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, respectively, into the Federal Union as States. Because I understand that your committee intends on April 24 to commence hearings on H. R. 331, which concerns Alaska, and to hold hearings beginning May 1 on H. R. 49, the Hawaiian proposal, I address this letter to you for the purpose of expressing the concurrence of the Department of Defense in both proposals.

As you know, the administration has repeatedly expressed itself as favoring Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood and both proposals have again and again been endorsed by the President. On January 4 in his state of the union message, President Truman urged that the Congress during 1950 "grant statehood to Alaska and Hawaii." The enactment of H. R. 49 and H. R. 331 would, I believe, effectively accomplish this objective.

You have asked in your letter of March 30 as to whether, from the point of view of national defense, it would be advantageous to extend statehood to Alaska and Hawaii, and you inquired specifically as to whether statehood would give greater strength to our military position in those areas than does the present territorial type of local government. It is obvious that the more stable a local government can be, the more successful would be the control and defense of the area in case of sudden attack. There can be no question but that in the event of an attack any State would be immensely aided in the initial stages of the emergency by the effective use of the State and local instrumentalities of law and order. By the same token it would seem to me that, as persons in a position to assist the Federal garrisons which might exist in Hawaii or Alaska, the locally elected governors, sheriffs, and the locally selected constabulary and civil defense units all would be of tremendous value in cases of sudden peril. Therefore, my answer to your question is that statehood for Alaska and Hawaii would undoubtedly give a considerable added measure of strength to the over-all defense of both areas in event of emergency.

I am not attempting in this letter to indorse the specific language of either of the bills under consideration, but I do wish strongly to support the principle of granting immediate statehood to both the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii as in the best interest of the United States and of all of its peoples both here and in the Territories.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS,
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, March 13, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is understood that there are now pending before your committee bills providing for the admission to statehood of the Territory of Alaska (H. R. 331) and the Territory of Hawaii (H. R. 49) which passed the House of Representatives on March 3 and March 7, 1950, respectively.

When bills on this subject were previously under consideration by Congress, the Board of Governors recommended to your committee in January 1948 and again in May 1949, an amendment relating to membership in the Federal Reserve System of national banks located in any Territory which is admitted to statehood. This is a matter which affects the banking structure of the United States and is of direct interest to the Board and the Federal Reserve System. Accordingly, the Board wishes to renew its recommendation in connection with the Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood bills now pending.

The Federal Reserve Act contains in section 19 a provision which makes membership in the Federal Reserve System optional in the case of national banks which are located in Alaska, in dependencies and insular possessions, and in "any part of the United States outside the continental United States." This

provision was enacted in 1913 when it was apparently the feeling of Congress that national banks in the Territories and dependencies were so distant and remote as to make it unnecessary to require them to be members of the Federal Reserve System. Because of this provision, membership in the system of national banks located in Alaska and Hawaii would continue to be optional if those Territories should become States in accordance with the provisions of the pending bills H. R. 331 and H. R. 49 as those bills now read.

Since the enactment of the Federal Reserve Act in 1913, the tremendous progress of air transportation has brought both Alaska and Hawaii so close that today it cannot be said that the economic and banking structures of Alaska and Hawaii are unrelated to those of the United States proper. Travel and transportation to these Territories are now a matter of hours instead of weeks as was the case in 1913; and, consequently, the advantages and privileges of membership in the Federal Reserve System would now be much more readily available to banks in Alaska and Hawaii. Moreover, banking conditions in these Territories have changed considerably since the enactment of the Federal Reserve Act. The total deposits of Hawaiian banks are many times as great as they were in 1913, and their total resources today are more than those of all banks in some of the States of the Union. While there is only one national bank in Hawaii at the present time, that bank is larger than any bank in 23 of the existing States. At the present time, there are four national banks in Alaska with total deposits of over \$30,000,000. None of the national banks in either Alaska or Hawaii is now a member of the Federal Reserve System.

It is the feeling of the Board, therefore, that if Congress should decide that the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii may now properly be admitted to statehood, national banks in the proposed States of Alaska and Hawaii should be subject to the same responsibilities and obligations as national banks located in any other State of the Union. The pending bills provide that, upon becoming States, Alaska and Hawaii shall be on an equal footing with the other States. It would seem logical that this equality should exist in the field of banking as well as in other respects and that, consequently, the proposed new States should be included in the Federal Reserve districts and that national banks in Alaska and Hawaii should be subject to the same requirements as other national banks.

Under present law, all national banks in the existing States of the Union are required to be members of the Federal Reserve System and, as such members, to be insured banks and to be governed by the many important statutory limitations and restrictions which by their terms are applicable to member and insured banks. These restrictions and limitations are not at present applicable to national banks in Alaska and Hawaii; and they would continue to be inapplicable if these Territories should become States in accordance with the provisions of the pending Statehood bills unless the bills are appropriately amended.

In the Board's opinion, there is no sound reason why any national banks located in a new State of the Union, enjoying the prestige and privileges conferred by organization under the National Bank Act, including the right to act as depositories of Government funds, should be exempt in this manner from the obligations and responsibilities which must be assumed by national banks in other States.

The Board recommends, therefore, that there be included in these bills a section which would have the effect of requiring national banks in any Territory to become members of the Federal Reserve System upon the formal admission of such Territory as a State of the Union. A draft of a brief amendment which would have this effect is enclosed herewith.

When a bill providing statehood for the Territory of Hawaii was under consideration in 1948, the Board consulted with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Comptroller of the Currency regarding the amendment proposed by the Board. Both of those agencies advised that they concurred in the Board's opinion that national banks located in any Territory should be required to become members of the Federal Reserve System upon the admission of the Territory to statehood.

The Board hopes that this matter will receive favorable consideration by your committee. We have heretofore been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the Bureau has no objection to the submission of this recommendation by the Board.

Very truly yours,

S. R. CARPENTER, *Secretary.*

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H. R. 49 AND H. R. 331

Insert in the bill H. R. — a new section reading as follows :

SEC. —. The first paragraph of section 2 of the Federal Reserve Act (U. S. C., title 12, secs. 222 and 223) is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu of such sentence the following :

"When any State is hereafter admitted to the Union the Federal Reserve districts shall be readjusted by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in such manner as to include such State. Every national bank in any State shall, upon commencing business or within 90 days after admission into the Union of the State in which it is located, become a member bank of the Federal Reserve System by subscribing and paying for stock in the Federal Reserve Bank of its district in accordance with the provisions of this Act and shall thereupon be an insured bank under section 12B of this Act, and failure to do so shall subject such bank to the penalty provided by the sixth paragraph of this section."

The CHAIRMAN. The first witness this morning will be Secretary Chapman of the Department of the Interior. We shall be very happy to hear from you, Mr. Secretary.

**STATEMENT OF HON. OSCAR L. CHAPMAN, THE SECRETARY OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

Secretary CHAPMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me a prepared statement that contains about 17 triple-spaced pages, but it constitutes primarily a historical review of the Hawaii statehood question, from the time the Constitution was extended to the Territory. If the chairman will permit me, I should like to submit that statement for the record. Copies have been submitted to each Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, they have been distributed.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I should like to discuss a few of the high points, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, it is so ordered.

(The prepared statement of Secretary Chapman is carried at the conclusion of his testimony.)

Secretary CHAPMAN. First I will give the history in this brief statement which shows beyond question, that the good faith of the United States Government is at stake in this case.

Our good faith is concerned because, if not by direct language, certainly, by implication, we promised the Hawaiians that they would be permitted to become a State at some future date.

The question now is, Hawaii prepared to become a State in accordance with this implied grant?

I want to make a few statements here which will bring into focus how this question looks to the average American citizen, and I say the average American citizen because in checking the press editorials throughout the country, we found that some 733 editorials were printed regarding statehood for Hawaii. Ninety-four percent of them favored it and urged immediate statehood. I think that fairly represents the thinking generally of the American people on the question of statehood.

You would naturally want to know next what the Defense Department's view is on this question. You have received a letter from the Secretary of Defense which has been made a part of this record. I would like to read just the last paragraph of the letter which emphasizes the importance of the question to our national defense.

Secretary Johnson says:

But I do wish strongly to support the principle of granting immediate statehood to both the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii as in the best interest of the United States and of all its people both here and in the Territories.

Next I have a letter directed to the chairman of this committee by the Assistant Secretary of State, Ernest A. Gross. I want to read a paragraph from that letter as follows:

The Department also considers that such action by the Congress would be an act in fulfillment of the obligation assumed by the United States in accepting the Declaration Regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories set out in chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and would thus serve to support American foreign policy and strengthen the position of the United States in international affairs.

I refer to those two letters to show you that we are trying, and I believe that every segment of our Government is trying, to fulfill our obligation and our promise to the Hawaiian people that the Territory will be made a State.

I want to discuss some of the questions that I know have been raised in opposition to statehood. I do not question the motives of any person who disagrees with me about statehood for Hawaii, any more than I did for Alaska, but I do think that this committee should know who is testifying, who is here, and what interest brought him here.

I want to say that Hawaii itself appropriated money as a part of its legislative functions to send representative citizens here to testify. I do not know of a more appropriate and democratic procedure than for the legislative body to appropriate money for such a purpose. Hawaiians are pleading today for the fulfillment of a promise that this Government made to them 50 years ago, and 50 years is a long time in the lifetime of an individual or even a nation. I think Hawaii is just as fully qualified to become a State as any other Territory when it gained statehood. Hawaii is fully capable and qualified to become a State today.

Some have argued that Hawaii cannot become a State and should not become a State because it is not contiguous to the west coast or contiguous to any of the 48 States. Twenty-five years ago that might have been a legitimate argument against statehood, but in view of the advance that we have made in transportation and communication, I cannot believe that anyone would take that too seriously. Moreover, if these two letters that I have read to you from the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State mean anything, they mean that we cannot pull out of Hawaii even if we wanted to. We have to stay in Hawaii to defend our position there. But let me say more than that: I am more interested in the civil rights of the citizens of Hawaii than I am in some of these other secondary benefits that may be derived by the American people as a whole, and I believe the American people definitely can derive benefits from the statehood of Hawaii. Our first consideration is the right of the citizens of Hawaii.

There are approximately 500,000 persons in Hawaii today. They are holding a constitutional convention which they have called with the hope and with the complete faith that this Congress will grant them statehood. Therefore, they have elected delegates to the constitutional convention and are holding their sessions to draft a constitution within the framework of our own Federal Constitution.

Gentlemen, the distance from Hawaii to Washington today is less than it was from New Mexico and Wyoming when they were admitted to the Union. An air-mail letter today can reach Hawaii within 2 days and probably 1 day, whereas it would have taken 10 to 12 days for a letter to reach Wyoming, New Mexico, or Idaho when they were admitted to the Union. Distance is thus not a valid ground for opposition to statehood.

I am happy to say that the business people of Hawaii are here to testify that they want statehood. Every element of the population of Hawaii is represented here and wants statehood.

They are asking for statehood on the grounds that we have promised it to them and that they are prepared to fulfill and meet the obligations that any Territory necessarily assumes when it becomes a State. I am going to tell you of another point that has been raised with me. Some people have been concerned about the racial complexity of Hawaii. Are we to ask Hawaii to apologize for her racial mixture? Are we to ask Hawaii to apologize to the American people because some of her citizens are of Japanese ancestry? If so, then why don't we of the Government remove every Japanese from American soil and send him home? We do not dare do it because you know it would break faith with every nation on earth.

It would not only break faith but it would be an affront to our national morality. It would be outrageous to think of such a thing.

Some people think because one-third of the population of Hawaii is of Japanese ancestry, that this group would vote as a bloc and would send you a Senator of Japanese ancestry. I am not averse to a citizen of the United States of Japanese ancestry sitting in this Senate. I am not saying that there would be one, but let me give you a little of the record to show you how they vote.

At present the speaker of the house is of Chinese ancestry, and the president of the senate is of Japanese ancestry. Who are these two gentlemen that I am talking about? Let me read you one page about them. They are sitting in this audience this morning, and I want them to hear what I have to say about them, and I want the American people to hear what I have to say about them and the fact that racial origin is not a determining factor in the life of Hawaii. That is dramatically illustrated by the action of the members of the house of representatives of the Territorial legislature in choosing as their speaker an American of Chinese ancestry. This despite the fact that the people of the Chinese race constitute a small part of their membership. The Territorial senate chose as its president an American of Japanese ancestry despite the fact that out of the 15 members of the senate, there is only one other member of Japanese ancestry.

Does that not show you that they are choosing their officials just as we try to choose them, on the basis of their ability to perform their functions and their loyalty to their government, to their people?

Now, these men were chosen by reason of their character, ability and their loyalty to their government. The speaker of the house, Mr. Hiram Fong, is here, and I wonder if he would be kind enough to stand. I do not wish to embarrass him by asking him to stand, but I think this is so important that any of us should be willing to take whatever embarrassment is necessary, if there is any, and I do not

think there is any. I would not be embarrassed if I were of Chinese ancestry. I would stand up to be counted wherever it might be.

Mr. Fong is a product of the institutions of America, a graduate of the University of Hawaii, and of the Harvard Law School. He is the product of our own institutions, where the American people send their boys for higher education.

Now, let us turn to the president of the senate. Wilfred Tsukiyama, who is a graduate of Coe College in Iowa and the Law School of Chicago. He was a former associate of the present Governor in the practice of law, which I do not think hurts him in the eyes of the people of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. If I remember correctly, he was a pretty good ballplayer in his time.

Secretary CHAPMAN. He was a good ballplayer. He was not only a good ballplayer on the field of baseball, but he is a good ballplayer in the science of government.

Mr. Tsukiyama was in the law firm of the present Governor, and I want to say there have been some people who have whispered to me that Governor Stainback was not in favor of statehood because he was carrying on a fight against communism in Hawaii. Governor Stainback is 100 percent for statehood for Hawaii, and he will tell you so himself.

I have not talked with him until this minute. He will tell you that of his own volition. He will tell you that he is for statehood in spite of the fact that he has fought communism in Hawaii as hard as any citizen could possibly fight it; and when you find a formula that will control and handle communism in Hawaii, let us have it, and we will apply it to Hawaii the same as we do to the rest of the States of the Union. That is all we ask.

Some people have talked about the racial mixture of the people of Hawaii. I want to give you just a brief picture of the racial mixture of these people. What difference does it make? One-third of the population, as I have told you before, is of Japanese ancestry, and what did we do?

During the last World War we transported over 100,000 Japanese American citizens, from Oregon, Washington, and California, and put them in camps in Arizona and Colorado and Wyoming. Why? Because the military people were concerned about their loyalty and were concerned about what they might do in the way of sabotage.

Let me say to you we did not do that in Hawaii. Of the half million people in Hawaii, one-third are of Japanese ancestry, and the Military Intelligence people will tell you, and the FBI will tell you that not one single case of sabotage by those of Japanese ancestry on that island was reported during the entire war. I think that is a pretty good record when you and I realize that blood runs thicker than water.

We know how these people must have felt about their families and their relatives back home, but nevertheless we do not have a single case on record where they tried to sabotage this Government during the course of the war. On the contrary, we do have the case of several thousand soldiers of Japanese ancestry fighting in Italy, on Anzio Beach, fighting for the democracy which they believed in.

They believed that we were going to fulfill our obligations to the people of Hawaii, and with other citizens of Hawaii they asked and fought for statehood. They have made an honorable record.

This record entitles the Japanese Hawaiians to credit, not ridicule of persons who have said that because they were citizens of Japanese ancestry, they could not be trusted.

We did trust them. We used them. We allowed them to be killed upon the fields of battle. Why can we not let them exercise the right of a true American citizen, the same as other citizens in Hawaii, as members of a State?

We have asked Hawaiian citizens to enlist in the Army and the Navy. They have done so. We have asked them to buy security bonds during the war. They have done so, and they have done so at a higher rate per capita percentage-wise than any of the States.

Now how can we and on what grounds can we deny these people the right of full citizenship? I am talking about the people of Hawaii, the melting pot of America, where one-third of the people belong to the Anglo-Saxon race and one-third to the Japanese race, and the other third belongs to a general mixture of six or seven different races. But again I say, do we have to apologize to the American people because Hawaii has a mixed racial composition?

(NOTE.—The tabulation referred to here is carried at the conclusion of Secretary Chapman's oral statement.)

Then how did New York City get into the Union? We let those citizens into the Union because we had confidence and faith in them. We believed in them, Senator. That is why we let them in. That is the basis on which we want to grant statehood to Hawaii.

Now there is another basis of criticism that I have heard.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me interrupt you, Mr. Secretary. With respect to the statistics from which you were quoting, the committee has had a table prepared as of August 11, 1949, by the Bureau of Health Statistics of the Department of Health of the Territory of Hawaii, which classifies the population on a racial basis. As of July 1, 1949, the total population was 530,981.

Secretary CHAPMAN. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Of which 461,581 are citizens.

Secretary CHAPMAN. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And 69,310 are aliens.

Secretary CHAPMAN. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Pure-Hawaiian population amounts to only 2 percent of the total, 10,548, all of whom are citizens.

Secretary CHAPMAN. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Part-Hawaiian amounts to 13.8 percent, 73,277, all of whom are citizens. 1.0 percent are Puerto Ricans, 10,081, all of whom are citizens. 30.8 percent, numbering 163,716 are Caucasians. Of these 160,991 are citizens, and 2,725 are aliens.

Five and nine-tenths percent of the total are Chinese, numbering 31,051, of whom 28,866 are citizens and 2,185 are aliens; 33.8 percent of the total are Japanese, numbering 179,702. Of these 149,216 are citizens, and 30,486 are aliens; 0.4 percent Koreans numbering 7,387, of whom 5,758 are citizens and 1,629 are aliens; 10.1 percent, numbering 53,361 are Filipinos, and of these 21,161 are citizens and 32,200 are aliens. Three-tenths of 1 percent makes up the balance of all other races numbering 1,768, of whom 1,683 are citizens and 85 are aliens. I have the same table that you have.

Secretary CHAPMAN. You have the same statistics except that I say, Senator, that was as of July 1, 1949. I think the later figures of January 1, 1950, would cut down that number of aliens that you see listed in the right-hand column. That percentage is materially cut down. The largest number you see in that group refers to Filipinos.

That was when, of course, we had a rather free exchange between the Philippines, the Hawaiian Islands, and the United States, between citizens of Philippine origin and the United States. Now that percentage itself has been cut down in the latest census of 1950, as of January 1, I am told. I do not happen to have the table before me.

The CHAIRMAN. We also have a more complete tabulation showing the civilian population estimates between July 1, 1948, and July 1, 1949, according to the geographic area, as well as this racial division. This table also comes from the Bureau of Health Statistics, Department of Health, Territory of Hawaii. Both these tables will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The documents above referred to follow:)

Civilian population estimates, Territory of Hawaii, July 1, 1948, and July 1, 1949

Geographic area	July 1, 1948	Jan. 1, 1949	July 1, 1949		Percent increase or decrease since July 1, 1948
			Number	Percent	
Territory of Hawaii.....	540,500	540,121	530,891	100.0	-1.8
County of Honolulu.....	371,649	369,016	360,085	67.8	-3.1
City of Honolulu.....	277,129	274,777	267,755	50.4	-3.4
Rural Oahu.....	94,520	94,239	92,330	17.4	-2.3
County of Hawaii.....	74,870	76,343	76,513	14.4	+2.2
City of Hilo.....	29,620	30,249	30,303	5.7	+2.3
Rural Hawaii.....	45,250	46,094	46,210	8.7	+2.1
County of Kalawao.....	411	402	380	.1	-7.5
County of Kauai.....	36,493	37,181	37,053	7.0	+1.5
Island of Kauai.....	36,283	36,969	36,840	6.9	+1.5
Island of Niihau.....	210	212	213	.1	+1.4
County of Maui.....	57,077	57,179	56,860	10.7	- .4
Island of Maui.....	48,544	49,092	48,778	9.2	+ .5
Island of Lanai.....	3,413	3,077	3,078	.6	-9.8
Island of Molokai (exclusive of county of Kalawao).....	5,120	5,010	5,004	.9	-2.3

Race	July 1, 1948	Jan. 1, 1949	July 1, 1949				Percent increase or de- crease since July 1, 1948
			Total		Citizens	Aliens	
			Number	Percent			
All races.....	540,500	540,121	530,891	100.0	461,581	69,310	-1.8
Hawaiian.....	10,650	10,604	10,548	2.0	10,548	-----	-1.0
Part Hawaiian.....	70,110	71,852	73,277	13.8	73,277	-----	+4.5
Puerto Rican.....	9,820	9,963	10,081	1.9	10,081	-----	+2.6
Caucasian.....	180,480	175,315	163,716	30.8	160,991	2,725	-9.3
Chinese.....	30,530	30,984	31,051	5.9	28,866	2,185	+1.7
Japanese.....	176,280	178,597	179,702	33.8	149,216	30,486	+1.9
Korean.....	7,320	7,392	7,387	1.4	5,758	1,629	+0.9
Filipino.....	53,640	53,696	53,361	10.1	21,161	32,200	-0.5
All others.....	1,670	1,718	1,768	0.3	1,683	85	+5.9

Source: Bureau of Health Statistics, Department of Health, August 11, 1949.

Senator BUTLER. Mr. Secretary, is there any later report or estimate of any kind showing the trend on a percentage basis, showing any different trend in the population than is indicated by the report that you have inserted in the record?

Secretary CHAPMAN. The Governor was just telling me that there has been a slight decrease in the trend of population, Senator, due somewhat to the unemployment situation that has developed during the last year. I do not know that we have any complete statistics other than the 1950, January 1, figures. Every 6 months you get these compilations.

Mr. Irwin Silverman tells me that in that right-hand column, Senator, there is a percentage of increase or decrease since July 1949, which shows the basis of each population, each racial group.

Senator BUTLER. That shows a very large drop in the Caucasian population.

Secretary CHAPMAN. That is right.

Senator BUTLER. And an increase in all of the others with the exception of the Filipino and Hawaiian.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Of course, you have to remember that many of the Army and Navy workers who became citizens of Hawaii at one time have left there since the general work of the Army has decreased since the war. I think these figures might vary slightly, but not very much, either way, as a normal picture of the racial population of the islands. There is a slight variation because of this abnormal year that we have had in Hawaii.

I want to say that there are business people here from Hawaii. They want to testify in favor of statehood for Hawaii. They have come here of their own free will. Mr. Joseph Farrington has a list of the witnesses he will present to this committee. He will ask that they be heard.

They are the business people who have invested their money in Hawaii. They have established the economy of those islands, along with the working people who helped establish it, because no money can establish an economy without the workingman helping to establish it. They have done that.

Having done that, they are here to ask for statehood for Hawaii. They have paid their own transportation here, Senator. It has not been paid by anyone else.

Senator BUTLER. In that connection, Mr. Secretary, this morning I received air-mail letters and telegrams to the effect indicating that there were a number of permanent citizens of Hawaii who wanted to come, but they could not make the arrangements to come with this delegation. In other words, they gave me the impression that those who came were in some way assisted by the organization of this delegation largely handled by the Hawaii Statehood Commission.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Well, I assume, Senator, that those people have come to testify as representatives of the group they pretend to represent or supposedly represent.

The legislative body of Hawaii has appropriated money and selected representatives to come in here and testify. I do not know of a more democratic way of petitioning Congress than that, do you?

Senator BUTLER. No. I am making no objections or suggestions, Mr. Secretary, except that apparently a goodly number are coming at the expense of the appropriation made by your legislature.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Sure. Not my legislature; Hawaii's Legislature.

Senator BUTLER. And in that connection, it would appear to me that it would be only fair that the Hawaiian Legislature, nor any other individual, in making public funds available, would be sure that we in the Senate might get the full picture. They apparently did not use one penny of the appropriation to see that the opposite side was presented, and I think everyone will admit that there are a few people in Hawaii who do not agree with you on the statehood matter, and I would like to have had the opportunity to have heard at least from one or two people who presented the opposite view.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Senator, a committee of this Congress sat for 3 weeks in Hawaii and petitioned even through the pages of the newspapers asking for those who opposed statehood to come in and testify. Very few testified.

Senator BUTLER. You know why.

Secretary CHAPMAN. No; I do not. I do not know why they did not. If I did not want statehood for the State of Colorado, I would say so. I would have wanted it if I had been there. I do not know why they did not appear and testify. If they did not want to testify in Hawaii, I do not think they want to come here to testify. I am certain the Territory of Hawaii would have been glad to put them on the plane and pay for their transportation the same as they did for the rest of them. I have found them to be a pretty fair-minded people. They fight fair, Senator.

Senator BUTLER. I am not disagreeing with you in the least. I have been there myself and they are a fine people.

I have not the slightest indication otherwise, but I would like to offer the suggestion that I offered in connection with the delegation that was here last week from Alaska, and the suggestion has been made by many other members of this committee and of Congress that it would be far better if a hearing of this kind could be conducted in the islands, in the Territory.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Senator, you have had so many hearings in Hawaii that they think every boat that lands has another delegation coming for another hearing. I do not mean that facetiously. If you will look at the record, you will see how many hearings have been held in Hawaii.

Senator BUTLER. I have looked at it.

Secretary CHAPMAN. You realize how many there are. How many more do we want? Senator Cordon sat in Hawaii representing this committee. He knows how many hearings there have been. I have here a list of them—a whole tabulation of them.

Who paid for those? The Legislature of Hawaii paid for them. They appropriated money to pay for the transportation of Senators and Congressmen. I think it was appropriate and proper for them to do so.

Senator BUTLER. I am not giving you my opinion on this matter. I am passing along the suggestions that have come to me from others—that the Senate of the United States would have had an opportunity to have gotten a much broader view had they held this hearing in Hawaii—and I am not certain that you would have any more witnesses against statehood out there than you would have here. I am not certain of that at all.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I would take your suggestion with great enthusiasm if we had not had so many hearings already in Hawaii. We have had them in Alaska; we have had them in Hawaii. We have had so many hearings that now we want to bring the question before you and ask for a decision.

I feel that if the opposition in Hawaii is so timid that it does not want publicly to state its opposition to statehood, then I do not think it has a case. I think those who propose statehood for Hawaii have a case, and I am not one of those who believes that the Big Five that you often hear about in Hawaii controls Hawaii.

I think they are trying to protect their investment, just as your citizens in Nebraska are trying to protect their investments, and I do not blame them. I would too. I believe the labor unions and other people of Hawaii are trying to protect their interests just like every other economic group in America.

I do not blame them for that, but if you cannot, after as many hearings as we have held in Hawaii, get somebody to stand up in the open and make his case openly, then I do not believe he has a case, and I believe we are entitled to say now is the time for a decision on this thing. We have gone at it long enough.

We have waited 50 years to comply with what I consider is an obligation involving the good faith of this Government. If I did not think Hawaii was prepared for this, I would not ask for it.

Senator BUTLER. Just a moment, Mr. Secretary. In connection with the population figures that you submitted awhile ago for the record, I wonder if it would be possible for you to insert also a similar statement as of the time Hawaii became a Territory.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Yes; I will be glad to submit that.

Senator BUTLER. With a racial analysis along the same lines of the one you inserted today.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I will be glad to submit that, if it is not already a matter of record.

(Secretary Chapman subsequently submitted the following tabulation:)

Population of Hawaiian Islands at time of annexation

Hawaiians and mixed blood	39,000
Japanese	25,000
Chinese	21,500
Portuguese	15,000
Americans	4,000
British	2,250
Germans and other Europeans	2,000
Polynesians and miscellaneous	1,250
Total	110,000

Source: Report of the Hawaiian Commission, appointed pursuant to the Newlands resolution of July 7, 1898. S. Doc. 16, 55th Cong., 3d sess.

Let me say this. These figures are correct according to the Census Bureau and according to the Health Census Bureau—even if Hawaii did not have one tenth of its present population, it would have more than Nebraska had when it was admitted to the Union.

That is not against Nebraska. I am saying that as a matter of history and record. I want you to remember this thing as we go along.

The Constitution has provided a way for the Territories to become members of the Union. Someone said to me the other day seriously before this committee, "How can we divide up Alaska? If you make such a big State out of it, you can never divide it again."

How did West Virginia get to be a State? It was made a State under the guidance and under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, that is how, and I am saying to you that Hawaii is ready. Hawaii is more prepared for statehood economically and socially than any State of the West that was ever admitted to the Union.

Senator BUTLER. I do not think there is anybody who can argue with you on that, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Thank you. I am glad I have your vote for this statehood, Senator.

I would like to say one or two more things in relation to this. I am not one of those who believes that if Hawaii becomes a State a small group will control it economically. I do not believe that is possible in any State in the Union today.

I do not think any small group of businessmen can control Hawaii economically, if it becomes a State, any more than they can now do it in Colorado, my home State.

Senator BUTLER. Can any other group control it?

Secretary CHAPMAN. I do not think they can. They have not been able to in any State I have found so far. Sure you have a difference of opinion swinging back and forth, that is public opinion. Naturally you have that.

I do not believe any group can control Hawaii any more than it can control any other State of the Union. They are no different from the rest of us. Let me give you one other figure to show you that Hawaii has grown up.

Hawaii is not just a little island out there in the Pacific clamoring for recognition to become a State in order to have two Senators admitted to this body. Hawaii is grown up in more ways than one.

Hawaii pays more and has paid more into the Treasury of the United States than 10 of our States pay today. Are we going to continue to allow taxation without representation? One of the fundamental principles that created this great Republic of ours, one of the great issues which we fought for is the principle of taxation with representation.

If there was ever a case in the history of this country where we are imposing taxes without representation, we are doing it in Hawaii which pays more money in taxes to the United States than 10 of our to the *n*th degree. A Territory with over half a million people and principal States, and we would say they are not ready for statehood?

I am more concerned with the civil rights of those people, with their right to vote, to participate fully under this democratic form of government, than I am with whether they pay more taxes than Colorado pays, which they do. I am concerned with their right to vote for Senators and Congressmen and their right to vote for the President of the United States. Some say to me "Why, if you do this, you are going to elect two Republican Senators." I would be delighted to have two Republican Senators from Hawaii. I do not care who they are. I will take a chance on the good judgment of the people of Hawaii.

Senator BUTLER. I will be fair with you. I would say I would not object to two good Democrats.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Maybe we will swap Alaska with you on that basis. They said the same thing in reverse on Alaska. To me that is not the argument. It is silly. It is not even an argument.

Look at the figures as to how they elected their State legislature, how close they are. They have a full two-party system operating in Hawaii. They are operating better than they are operating in a lot of our States in this Union; a full two-party system is operating in Hawaii.

Senator BUTLER. You did not hear what happened to the Democratic convention out there yesterday?

Secretary CHAPMAN. Yes; I did hear that. I think they were very honorable and honest people, and I think they acted wisely.

The Democrats of Hawaii have been trying to get the Communists out of the party for a long time, and I think they can get rid of them. I do not think there is any question about it.

Governor Stainback has been telling us for years that they ought to kick them out, but you could not identify them. We have identified a few of them. As they have been identified, they have been pushed out.

Senator BUTLER. You admit I helped a little on that?

Secretary CHAPMAN. I do admit that, Senator. Senator, I admit that you have been extremely helpful in this Hawaiian case. I say that in all seriousness.

You have been helpful in pointing out the things that have been weaknesses sometimes in our position. I appreciate that. You have made us go back to get the facts and information to justify our position. That is your duty and responsibility, and I am happy to say that you have done it. I am not being critical of any member of this committee for anything he has done or said, but I am saying to you in the name of the people of Hawaii and the American people and the good faith of the American people, don't ask us to go back to Hawaii for another hearing. You have had enough hearings. Either say "No" today or say "Yes."

I am supporting the bill that was approved by the House of Representatives. There may be many changes that you will want to make. Some people have asked me about the land section. There is not enough public land involved in this for me to worry about, there only being a half million acres of land.

The House has provided in the bill that they make in the course of about 5 years a determination as to what disposition shall be made of those 500,000 acres of land. I am willing to leave it that way. I do not want to argue about the disposition of land in Hawaii. I am more interested in the civil rights of the people of Hawaii than I am in a half million acres of land.

It is important to us, it is important to the people of Hawaii how we treat them in that respect.

I think you gentlemen here have seen demonstrated year after year the good faith of the citizens of Hawaii, a republic that had its own independence before it asked for annexation under our Constitution, and we did extend the Constitution to Hawaii. We also extended it to Alaska.

Now we are asking you to extend full citizenship to the Hawaiians so that every citizen will have a full right to vote and support their people, their President, their members of the House, their members of the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, do you have any knowledge as to the reasons why the House of Representatives postponed decision on the public lands question?

Secretary CHAPMAN. I think it is because, Senator, there is a difference—

The CHAIRMAN. There are approximately 6,400 square miles in the entire Territory of Hawaii. My recollection is that the density of population is estimated at something in excess of 80 per square mile, so that with such a small area and such a high density rate, it would seem that unless there were some really important reasons for postponing decision, that it might very well be made at this time, if the bill is to be enacted.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Senator, the reason that the House did not pass upon that and try to settle the land question is there was obviously a difference of opinion among the members of the House committee that passed on the bill, and they felt that the paramount issue before them was statehood for Hawaii and not the disposition of this small acreage of land.

Therefore, they left it so that Congress can settle it within the next 5 years. They set up a system in which a joint committee of the Senate and House can determine how to settle that land.

Now I think it is more important to settle whether they can vote as citizens of the United States than it is to determine how to dispose of a half million acres of land. Now that is why they did not do it. They felt that the paramount issue was statehood.

They wanted it separated, and decided by itself, and they left Congress the right and opportunity to decide that issue at a later date, and they have so stated in this bill on page 11.

The CHAIRMAN. What I am trying to determine is what was the basis of the difference of opinion.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Oh, I think the principal difference, Senator, was the question of how to dispose of the 500,000 acres of land, whether every other section should be given to the State of Hawaii and the rest be retained by the Federal Government, or whether we should let them select in one solid group 180,000 acres or a certain number of acres—I think it is 180,000—or whether we should work it out on the same principle that we did for the Western States as they came into the Union.

I think that was their difference of opinion, and the very reason that you stated created that difference of opinion, the density of population and the small acreage involved.

As the governor says, it was a republic to start, a free and independent state. You have no public land in Texas. It was a republic when it was annexed to the Union, so that question arose and became involved in this, but I do not think there is anything fairer that Congress has ever done, and I do not think anything more intelligent, than to say "Do not mix this with statehood."

You have set 5 years in this bill. We will decide that later on. We will decide whether we want to keep it all or give it all to Hawaii. You have a right to decide that.

Now with that in mind, I want to decide the statehood issue by itself and separately.

Senator BUTLER. Mr. Secretary, would you have any objection to the Senate committee amending the Alaska statehood bill? I do not want to mingle Alaska with Hawaiian statehood, but last week in our Alaska hearings this public-land question consumed a large share of the time, and it is not settled as yet.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Yes.

Senator BUTLER. But do you think it could be simplified by making the public-land provisions of the Hawaii statehood bill a part of the Alaska statehood bill?

Secretary CHAPMAN. Senator, they are so dissimilar, they are so unlike in reality, that there is just no way to compare them, a population in Alaska, an estimated population, of 135,000 with an acreage of 365,000,000, compared with Hawaii which has a half a million people, and we are talking about a half million acres of public land.

Senator BUTLER. But the principle involved I think would be about the same, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Senator, let me say this to you, and I will commit my Department to this. I do not agree with your amendment of giving every other section to the State of Alaska for statehood. I think it is wrong, I think it is bad management in every way that you look at it.

I do not mean to say that I think the Federal Government has done a perfect job of management, but I think we can do a better job in the State of Alaska for a few years until they are better organized and have an opportunity to get control, but if that would win your vote for this bill, I am more concerned about the rights of the people of Alaska than I am with their land, and we will have a chance to correct the bad management that will come out of that later on. I will take it that way.

Senator BUTLER. I apologize. I do not want to detract you from—

Secretary CHAPMAN. Senator, you do not detract me. The principle runs across the whole board, you are right about that.

The whole question of Alaska is involved in this as it is with any other State that comes into the Union, and again I say to you I do not agree with it, but I would not recommend veto of this bill if you passed it with that in it, because I am concerned about the rights of the people of Alaska, having their right to vote the same as I do, and that right for the people of Hawaii. It is the rights of the people that I am interested in. I am also interested in the management of our natural resources.

I do not believe Alaska, with 365,000,000 acres of land, can adequately and properly manage every other section. Now if they can and you think they can, and this Congress agrees with you, I promise you I will not recommend a veto of that bill. I still think it is wrong but I would not recommend a veto.

Why? Because I think the paramount issue we are talking about here today is the rights of people who have gone into these areas, who have had the intestinal fortitude to try to make a living in those areas, particularly with respect to Alaska do I say that.

In Hawaii they come up to you with less than approximately a half million acres of land, with a half million people involved, and I want

their rights protected. I want the democratic principle extended to Hawaii. That is all I am asking, and I am asking that irrespective of any race that they may come from or any religion that they may maintain.

I want them to have that right that we have, you and I. We have that. I want the citizens everywhere to have that right.

This does not apply to Puerto Rico, Senator, as I have heard some people say before. Puerto Rico is an entirely different category.

We never extended the Constitution to Puerto Rico as we extended it to Hawaii and Alaska. Puerto Rico does not pay any income tax into the Treasury of the United States. They do not want statehood. You heard the Governor of Puerto Rico say to you a few weeks ago, "No, we like our relationship as we have it. Let us develop it a little bit more along this line. We like it. We do not ask for statehood. We do not want it."

But these are people who have been paying taxes for years and have had no voice in their government, Senator, and I will go one step further. If there is any man in Hawaii who wants to be heard and cannot afford his transportation, I will ask the Governor to petition the Legislature of Hawaii to pay his transportation to come here and be heard.

I want every man to be heard on both sides of this question. If I cannot win on the merits of my case, then I should lose it, but if there was ever a Territory that came to Congress petitioning the right to be heard, never a Territory came with better credentials than Hawaii is handing you today.

Gentlemen, I hope you agree with me. I would like to have the Governor follow me on the stand if you have no objection, Senator O'Mahoney.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions to be addressed to the Secretary? Very well, Mr. Secretary, we are indebted to you for your statement.

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR OSCAR L. CHAPMAN

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Department of the Interior has consistently supported statehood for Hawaii. It has done so for a number of reasons, which I should like to review briefly for the committee.

Hawaii has had since its incorporation into the Union 50 years ago a continuing claim to statehood. It should be admitted as a State without further delay.

Hawaii's relationship with the mainland dates back to the earliest days of our Republic. This relationship was formalized in 1898, when Hawaii voluntarily surrendered its independence in order to become a part of the United States. The document by which the people of Hawaii gave their consent to annexation declared that this action was taken "in view of the natural dependence of the Hawaiian Islands upon the United States, of their geographical proximity thereto, of the preponderant share acquired by the United States and its citizens in the industries and trades of said islands, and of the expressed desire of the Government of the Republic of Hawaii that those islands should be incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof * * *." The Newlands resolution of July 7, 1898, by which the Congress accepted the cession of sovereignty offered by the Hawaiian people, declared that the islands were "annexed as a part of the territory of the United States."

The annexation resolution contemplated that the Congress would provide for the government of the islands, and this was done in 1900, when the Organic Act of the Territory of Hawaii was enacted. Among other things, the organic act pro-

vided that the Constitution of the United States should have the same force and effect within Hawaii as elsewhere in the United States. When the Constitution has been extended to a Territory, that Territory is said to be "incorporated" into the Union. It is also significant that the people of Hawaii expressed their desire to be "incorporated" in the document by which they consented to annexation. We have had incorporated Territories in the past, and one by one they have become States, all except Hawaii and Alaska. Hawaii, as all other incorporated Territories, should be admitted into the Union.

The first of the incorporated Territories was the Northwest Territory, comprising lands lying northwest of the Ohio River and ceded to the Federal Government by the Original Thirteen States. The Northwest Ordinance, which the Congress enacted to provide for the Government of the Territory, and by which the Territory was incorporated, set a precedent for granting to an incorporated Territory local self-government, certain basic civil and political rights, representation in the Congress and eventual statehood. Organic legislation for the Southwest Territory, the Territory of Orleans, the Oregon Territory, and others, was patterned on the Northwest Ordinance and in some instances whole sections of that ordinance were copied. In due course all the Territories which had been created on the mainland were admitted to the Union. Admission of Hawaii would carry out the pattern established so long ago, and fulfill our pledge.

In the early organic acts, admission was expressly authorized when the population of the Territory reached a certain figure. Hawaii has met all of the tests. In fact, it has been qualified for some time.

Hawaii's population of over half a million exceeds that of seven of the States, including one of the Original Thirteen, and is larger than that of any Territory, except Oklahoma, at the time of admission. Its population, though composed of a mixture of races, is thoroughly Americanized. It is the only area under United States sovereignty in which Americans and Europeans, Polynesians, and Asiatics, have together formed a harmonious American community.

Hawaii should not be required to apologize for or minimize the significance of its heterogeneous racial complexion. Anyone who has been in Hawaii invariably comes away impressed with the harmony of the social, political, and business life of the Territory. In this respect, as in many others, Hawaii offers an example to many of the States.

In area, Hawaii is larger than the combined area of Connecticut and Rhode Island.

Geographically, Hawaii is an entity of considerable importance to the United States. What we do in Hawaii is watched and weighed throughout Asia, in Japan, the Philippines, India, Indonesia, and China. The granting of statehood to Hawaii can be a very real contribution to our fight against communism, a fight in which the people of Hawaii join.

I do not need to belabor the point that we cannot afford to underestimate the strategic significance of Hawaii in what has been called the Era of the Pacific, nor can we fail to take any action which will bind Hawaii even closer to the United States. Viewed in this light, Hawaii's proximity to Asia and its physical separation from the mainland is an advantage, rather than an obstacle to statehood. In fact, you will note that the annexation document, from which I quoted earlier, refers to the "geographical proximity" of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States. It is their nearness, not their distance, that was then emphasized. And if that was so then, how much more appropriate it is to dwell upon Hawaii's proximity today, when the plane, the radio, and the telephone have virtually eliminated the barrier of distance. It took 30 to 60 days for a letter to reach Washington from Mississippi in 1817, when Mississippi was admitted; it took 3 to 4 months from California in 1850; 20 to 40 days from Oregon in 1859; 10 to 20 days from Nebraska in 1867; and even as recently as 1912, 8 to 10 days from New Mexico. Yet via air mail, a letter from Hawaii will arrive in Washington in 1 to 2 days today.

The people of Hawaii have repeatedly asked for statehood. Within 2 years from the time Hawaii was annexed to the United States, the Territorial legislature petitioned the Congress for statehood and almost every legislature since that time has taken similar action. The people themselves voted directly in favor of statehood, two to one, in a plebiscite held in 1940. They are so earnest in their desire for statehood, so confident that the Congress will enact enabling legislation, and so anxious that no time be lost after enabling legislation is passed, that they have already made provision for a constitutional convention which began meeting on April 4 to draft the constitution of the State of Hawaii. All evidence of national sentiment on this issue reveals overwhelming support for

Hawaiian statehood. A survey of press reaction indicates that in a recent year 733 editorials in 282 newspapers, representing 48 States, and a combined circulation of more than 25,000,000, were devoted to the subject of Hawaiian statehood, and that 94 percent of the comment was prostatehood.

Hawaii's finances are in exceptionally good order. Its government is on a sound footing, and it pays into the Federal Treasury a total of taxes, larger than that paid by 10 States, even though it has no voice in drafting Federal tax legislation applicable to the Territory. The percentage of individuals filing Federal income tax returns exceeds that of 24 States. During the recent war, Hawaii's per capita purchase of E bonds was higher than that of any State or Territory, averaging \$531.12 and all the Territory's war-bond quotas were oversubscribed, one by as much as 205 percent.

The people of Hawaii have since 1900 been governing themselves in much the same manner as the people of the States, although they are denied certain rights of self-government which the citizens of States enjoy. The Governor, the Secretary (who corresponds to lieutenant governor), and the judges are Presidential appointees.

But the Territorial legislature is popularly elected, and has legislative powers virtually as broad as those of State legislatures. The Territory raises its own revenues, and is fully self-supporting. It pays all the expenses of the Territorial and county governments, except for the salaries of members of the Territorial legislature and of Presidential appointees. The laws it has enacted are progressive. The school system of the Territory compares very favorably with those in the States. The people are politically conscious to a marked degree; the percentage of registered voters who exercise their franchise is high. Although Hawaii is generally identified with the Republican Party, there is an active two-party system in the Territory.

Committees of the Congress have considered and reported on statehood for Hawaii with great regularity. Not a single one of these committees has recommended against statehood. Several, by House and Senate groups, have urged immediate enactment of statehood legislation. The records of hearings contain a thoroughgoing study of every aspect of Hawaiian life. The House has twice enacted enabling legislation and submitted it to the Senate.

There is no valid reason why Hawaii should not be admitted to the Union now. Hawaii has been a Territory for a longer period than anyone would have supposed necessary, particularly in view of the fact that at the time of annexation, it was an independent republic and had been governing itself for years. It is contrary to all of our principles to delay any longer the enactment of enabling legislation. Hawaii should not be required to carry many of the burdens of a State while being subject to the discriminations that inevitably accompany Territorial status, among the most notable of which are the lack of a vote in either House of the Congress and therefore the lack of a voice in the laws made applicable to it, and inability to vote in Presidential elections. Taxation without representation is no less unjust and irritating to the people of Hawaii than it was to the founders of our Republic. The people of Hawaii, who are citizens of the United States, and who have convincingly demonstrated their loyalty to the United States should no longer be subjected to the humiliation that they are not considered "good enough" to be taken into the Union in every sense of the word, apparently solely because they live on an island.

I have heard it said that Hawaii should not be admitted because it is a hotbed of Communist activity. This is nonsense. Only a few days ago the House Committee on Un-American Activities returned from its recent investigation. It clarified the problem of communism so far as it involves this Territory.

The testimony showed very clearly that Communist activity in Hawaii found its inspiration in Communist headquarters in the States and is an integral part thereof. It is therefore clearly part of the national problem.

The testimony also showed that Communist activity in the Territory has been limited to a very small group. The Communist problem, as exposed by these hearings, was shown to be one that can be dealt with successfully by the people of Hawaii themselves insofar as it can be dealt with on a local basis. In fact, there is good reason to believe that in this respect they are probably better prepared to deal with it than are many other communities in this country. The intense interest of the people of the Territory in the proceedings of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the public reaction to its findings, and the steps already taken to deal with this problem can leave no doubt whatsoever that the people of Hawaii are completely alert to the dangers of communism. By granting statehood the Congress will further strengthen the determination of

Hawaiians to cope with communism, and will deny to the Communists further use of the statehood issue in their problem of persuasion.

The investigation can leave no doubt that this problem offers no reasons whatsoever for delaying action on the question of statehood, but on the contrary offers reason for the enactment of this bill. There are many persons who believe the people of the islands will be better equipped to deal with the program as a State than they are as a Territory.

The President in his 1946, 1948, 1949, and 1950 messages on the State of the Union, and in his 1948 message dealing with the civil-rights program, urged admission of Hawaii. Both political parties have included it repeatedly in their platforms. It is a nonpartisan question.

I urge that this committee report favorably and promptly on the Hawaii statehood bill.

Governor Stainback, we will be glad to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF HON. INGRAM M. STAINBACK, GOVERNOR OF HAWAII

Governor STAINBACK. My name is Ingram M. Stainback, Governor of Hawaii since 1942. I am going to read a statement taken largely from an article which I wrote some years ago for what is called the State Government Magazine, a magazine published by the Governors of the various States. I have tried to bring some of the facts up to date. First, the Territory of Hawaii consists of a group of eight islands and numerous islets in the Pacific Ocean, situated a little more than 2,000 nautical miles west of the North American continent. The total land area is 6,438 square miles, an area slightly larger than the combined area of Connecticut and Rhode Island. The islands are of volcanic origin. From southeast to northwest the eight principal islands are Hawaii, Kahoolawe, Maui, Lanai, Molokai, Oahu, Kauai, and Niihau. The largest island in the Territory and the youngest, geologically, which incidentally is still in the making, is Hawaii, with an area of 4,030 square miles. The population of the Territory was estimated at 527,473 January 1, 1950, exclusive of military and naval personnel.

It is somewhat smaller than the amount given here because there has been a decrease in population of about 20,000 over the last year because of our unemployment problem and the fact that the boom years of the war with the large expenditures in the navy yard and fortifications have ceased.

Senator BUTLER. Is there any unemployment there now, Governor?

Governor STAINBACK. It is higher there than in any State of the Union. It is twice the rate, something like 16 percent, and I hope to see Mr. Steelman in the next day or two and take up this problem. I made a memorandum covering the situation, and I hope that we can get some relief.

Secretary CHAPMAN. May I make one statement there, Governor. The unemployment in Hawaii is on the same ratio that one county in Maryland is on as of last Friday.

Governor STAINBACK. On unemployment I may add it is almost entirely as I have shown by the memorandum, due to the fact that the Federal Government has ceased to expend large sums of money in the Territory. We had a tremendous number of troupes, I suppose a million men, who passed through Hawaii during the war period. You had a tremendous boom there.

You had a large influx of laborers from the mainland, and with the ceasing of this large employment by the Federal Government, removal of troops, naturally you had to expect a deflation, and Mr. Bridges' 6-month strike did not help us any, coming on top of the other.

Secretary CHAPMAN. And he is a citizen of California, not of Hawaii.

Governor STAINBACK. That is right. We hope California will keep him.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I just want to keep this record straight.

Governor STAINBACK. I have listed here the population as of January 1, which I will not read. It is somewhat smaller than the amount which has heretofore been read because the figures are a little bit later.

Concerning the historical background, it has been pointed out, 50 years ago yesterday, on April 30, 1900, Hawaii became an incorporated territory and integral part of the United States.

On the part of the United States, annexation was accomplished by the Newlands resolution of July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750). On the part of the Republic of Hawaii, annexation was accomplished by ratification of a treaty, which recited—

the expressed desire of the government of the Republic of Hawaii that those Islands should be incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof—

Thus, Hawaii constitutes one of the two instances in our history in which annexation of a territory has been by voluntary action of the people of that territory, Texas being the only other instance, and I think that is of some importance in weighing Hawaii's right to citizenship.

They were an independent nation, had their own government, had practiced constitutional government for at least 50 years before annexation, and I think that is a matter which is entitled to considerable weight. I will later on give the history of previous negotiations where Hawaii almost became a State 50 years prior to 1900.

Two years later, Hawaii was made a Territory of the United States by specific provisions of the Hawaiian Organic Act (31 Stat. 141). The Hawaiian Organic Act organized and established a government for the Territory of Hawaii and serves as its constitution. Under terms of this organic act, the Constitution of the United States is extended to Hawaii as follows:

SEC. 5. United States Constitution. That Constitution, and, except as otherwise provided, all the laws of the United States, including laws carrying general appropriations, which are not locally inapplicable, shall have the same force and effect within the Territory as elsewhere in the United States; * * *

Supreme Court decisions point out that incorporation is granted only by specific action of the United States Congress, which applies to the Constitution too.

From the standpoint of constitutional law, the Territory of Hawaii is an organized incorporated political subdivision of the United States destined to become a State on an equal footing with the Original States at such time as the Congress shall so will.

The Secretary has pointed out to you that statehood is guaranteed under the provisions of which we came into the Union.

It is of historical interest to note that the first attempt to bring Hawaii into the Union as a State occurred in 1854 during the reign of Hawaii's King Kamehameha III. Article II of the uncompleted Annexation Treaty of 1854, I believe negotiated by Daniel Webster, which had been negotiated by the Hawaiian Foreign Minister and the United States Commissioner to the Kingdom of Hawaii provided as follows:

The Kingdom of the Hawaiian Islands shall be incorporated into the American Union as a State, enjoying the same degree of sovereignty as other States, and admitted as such as soon as it can be done in consistency with the principles and requirements of the Federal Constitution, to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of a State as aforesaid, on a perfect equality with the other States of the Union.

Now why in 1900 they did not insist on becoming a State as Texas did, I do not know. Possibly the large foreign population in Hawaii at that time had some bearing on it.

When Congress enacted the Hawaiian Organic Act in 1900 granting Hawaii status as an incorporated Territory, Congress then and there committed the United States to the ultimate granting of statehood to Hawaii. The courts have referred to organized, incorporated Territories as "inchoate" States; as States in "pupilage" and as "embryo" States. I am not going to quote them all.

In the case of *O'Donoghue v. United States* (289 U. S. 537), the court held:

Since the Constitution provides for the admission by Congress of any States, it properly may be said that the outlying continental public domain, of which the United States was the proprietor, was, from the beginning, destined for admission as a State or States into the Union; that as a preliminary step toward that foreordained end—to tide over the period of ineligibility—Congress, from time to time, created territorial governments, the existence of which was necessarily limited to the period of pupilage.

This same court pointed out—

And the Territories acquired by Congress, whether by deed of cession from the Original States, or by treaty with a foreign country, are held with the object, as soon as their population and condition justify it, of being admitted into the Union as States, upon an equal footing with the Original States in all respects.

You could not say the rights of Hawaii would be less because it came in voluntarily, than if it had been purchased like Alaska.

The Territories thus differ from the District of Columbia, which permanently is governed by Congress. In the *O'Donoghue* case, the court contrasted the District of Columbia and the Territories, saying:

In the District clause, unlike the Territorial clause, there is no more linking of the legislative processes to the disposal and regulation of the public domain—the landed estates of the sovereign—within which transitory governments to tide over the period of pupilage may be constituted, but an unqualified grant of permanent legislative power over a selected area set apart for the enduring purposes of the general government, to which the administration of purely local affairs is obviously subordinate and incidental. * * *

I might point out one of the decisions related to the tenure of government. You gentlemen who are lawyers, and probably the rest of you too, are familiar with article III of the Constitution, section 1, which provided that judges shall hold office on good behavior. Now the judges of the Territory are appointed for definite specific terms. How do you qualify that with the provisions that the judges of the United States Government and the courts, in arriving at the conclusion that

they could appoint them for an indefinite term, pointed out that these judges were not permanent, that they were just in court for a period there which was Territorial organization, and for that reason the judges' terms are limited. You have many judges—in fact, I myself held the position of a judge in violation of the Constitution of the United States—so I think it is rather conclusive that they were destined to become States. It is merely a temporary expedient when Congress sets up a Territorial government. It shows conclusively that Congress would not violate the Constitution of the United States.

It must be remembered that none of the other islands under the sovereignty of the United States was given Territorial status by the Congress. In a series of cases called the Insular cases, it was established that the other islands are mere dependencies, and as the Secretary clearly pointed out, Puerto Rico is not taxed. They do not labor under the situation. There is a dependency where your constitutional provisions at least do not in total apply.

The Philippines were in the same position before they were liberated as in the various insular cases and it was decided that they were possessions and not Territories, so there we have, I think, an admitted doctrine that an organized Territory of the United States has an ultimate destiny of statehood. Then the only question left is has it satisfied the requirements of a State so that it can realize what Congress intends for it.

We believe Hawaii has passed what is frequently called the period of pupillage.

During the 50 years that Hawaii has been a part of the United States, 50 years of pupillage, Hawaii has increased and developed in wealth and in population. It has long ago met the customary economic requirements for statehood. The gross assessed value of real property in the islands is over \$589,000,000. According to all available data, this is higher than that of any State at the time of admission, with the exception of Oklahoma. The United States census estimates of last year point out that Hawaii exceeds six States in population, and is comparable to four others.

In other words, we compare in population fairly close to 10 States, and we pay now even in our period of depression, taxes equal to that paid by 10 States, or exceeding that.

It has a high standard of health and for a number of years has had a lower death rate than any State in the Union. If you will search the Army records, you will find that the health rate in Hawaii is better than that of any Army post in the United States. This very low death rate I say is to some extent due to the fact that we have a young population out there. There are a lot of people coming out to work and we did not have people who had reached old age. All growing States have a low death rate because they grow by migration of young people. The older people do not come in except, shall I say, in California. They go out there to live in comfort in their old age.

Ordinarily a State that is growing has a young population, and so they have a low death rate, so we cannot claim to be more healthy than any State, but certainly we stand as well as other States.

Our schools are well equipped and well attended; our teachers are far better paid than the average teachers in mainland United States schools.

I might go a little further than that and say they are better paid than any State in the Union except New York and California. We are about on a par with New Jersey which comes in third, so far as the educational requirement and pay of teachers is concerned. We stand among the top States. I do not believe those statistics have changed. I looked them up last year when we had a meeting of the legislature. If they have changed—

Senator CORDON. Governor, would it bother you if I interrupt you to ask a question?

Governor STAINBACK. Not at all.

Senator CORDON. I think it would be interesting to the members who are present, and to the whole committee when the record is prepared, if you would discuss a little bit more your school system.

Governor STAINBACK. We have a school system there which might be termed a centralized system. In fact, Hawaii has always been rather a centralized government due to the fact that it was a monarchy and most of the powers are retained in the Territory's central system.

We have very little county or city powers, so our school system is centralized. We have one system for the whole Territory. We have a board of education which is appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the senate, a superintendent of public education who occupies the same position.

We have one system of schools throughout the Territory, and therefore you do not find the grade-school system where one county is poor and the teachers are very poorly paid and in a rich county they are more adequately paid. We have a uniform system throughout the Territory.

It makes no difference; it may be a rural region stuck out in the middle of Hawaii or some of the other so-called outlying lands. They get similar pay for similar work.

Senator CORDON. And the same type, the same qualifications, with reference to the teaching staff?

Governor STAINBACK. That is right; yes, sir. We have here an article entitled "School Finance Systems, Elementary and Secondary Schools, Territorial Support of Public Schools in Hawaii, Revised January 1950." I will be glad to put that in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be placed in the record at this point.

(The document above referred to follows:)

SCHOOL FINANCE SYSTEMS, HAWAII

Series 1. State systems: Elementary and secondary schools

TERRITORIAL SUPPORT OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN HAWAII¹

The Territory of Hawaii has a unique educational organization and administration, for it is determined both by the terms of the organic act of Congress for the Territory and by laws enacted by the Territorial legislature. To the Territorial department of public instruction has been delegated full authority and responsibility for the administration of the system of public schools. Although the schools are administered by the department of public instruction, the erection, maintenance, and repair of school buildings are functions of the board of supervisors of the four counties.

Expenditures for schools in the Territory of Hawaii are made from the general funds and the special school fund. The first fund is provided by the Territory, and the second, by the three counties and the city and county of Honolulu.

¹Prepared for the research division, National Education Association, by George H. McLane, executive secretary, Hawaii Statehood Commission, Territory of Hawaii.

The special school fund, which consists of money raised by taxation in each of the three counties and in the city and county of Honolulu, is used for construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation of the school plant, including janitor service and supplies.

Territorial law states that the city and county of Honolulu must appropriate annually for new construction not less than the sum of \$100,000; and for other expenses connected with the school plant, not less than \$850,000.

The special school fund for each area is based upon a budget prepared by the department of public instruction and approved by the county board of supervisors. After consideration of the budget presented to it, the county board of supervisors may, in its discretion, change any of the items, then submit the revised budget to the Territorial treasurer, in order that the real property tax rate which furnishes the largest part of this revenue in the counties may be determined. The funds are under the control of the boards of supervisors, with the exception of the part set aside for janitor service and supplies, which is expended by the Territorial department of public instruction.

Hawaii—Share of Federal, Territorial, and local governments in school support

	Percent
Federal.....	1.3
Territorial.....	82.7
Local.....	16.0

The Territory of Hawaii receives Federal aid in most categories of aid to States. The funds are administered in the local school units by the department of public instruction, except for buildings and maintenance, which are cared for by the county budget. Aside from grants for higher education, Hawaii received \$212,310 from the Federal Government for education in the fiscal year 1949. During 1949, Hawaii also received \$54,000 from the United States Army and Air Force combined for education of children of civil-service employees and persons connected with Army and Air Force establishments.

The total amount spent for the 186 public schools in the Territory of Hawaii in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, was \$15,159,802. The Territory spent \$13,367,772, or 82.7 percent of the total. The four county units spent \$2,569,720, or 16 percent of total school expenditures. The Federal Government's share, \$212,310, was 1.3 percent.

Of the total expenditure by the Territory for all purposes during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, 20.4 percent was for schools. The average per pupil cost of the schools in the school year, exclusive of capital outlay, was \$178.39, the average year's enrollment being 86,481.

SOURCES OF TERRITORIAL SCHOOL REVENUE

The general fund is used to pay all Territorial school costs except those school operational costs (for janitor service and supplies) delegated to the counties. The chief tax sources of the general fund are income taxes and business licenses taxes. No part of the proceeds of any Territorial tax is earmarked for the public schools, except that provided for new kindergartens as noted below.

TABLE 1.—*Sources of territorial school revenue, 1948-49*

Source	Amount	Percent
1. Legislative appropriations:		
(a) Administration.....	\$387,038	3.2
(b) Teachers' salaries.....	10,596,396	86.8
(c) Instructional supplies and equipment.....	404,988	3.3
(d) Auxiliary services.....	815,414	6.7
Total.....	¹ 12,203,826	100.0

¹ One-half of biennial appropriation for the 1949-51 biennium, excluding \$23,650 for Territorial expenditures for operation, maintenance, and improvements.

Legislative appropriations from the Territorial general fund.—The amount of the general fund revenues used for public schools in each biennium is based upon an estimate of school costs made by the Territorial board of commissioners of public instruction, which follows the regular budgetary and appropriation

procedure for other Territorial expenditures. The total appropriation for 1948-49 included \$10,596,386 for instruction, \$404,988 for instructional supplies and equipment, and \$815,414 for auxiliary services.

Funds for vocational education allocated by the Federal Government to the Territory were matched dollar for dollar from the general fund.

APPORTIONMENT OF TERRITORIAL SCHOOL FUNDS

The Territory of Hawaii provide support in full for the greater part of the public-school program. It gives no assistance to the counties in financing that part of the school program which is delegated to the counties—the part relating to the construction, maintenance, operation, and equipment of the school plant. On the other hand, as already stated, the counties provide the funds for meeting certain costs of operation of the school plant, the payments for part of which are administered by the Territorial department of public instruction.

Support of general school program.—The 1949 legislature appropriated for the department of public instruction the sum of \$24,454,952 for the 1949-51 biennium. The major part of this amount, \$21,192,771, is for personal services in the instruction division. Teachers' salary payments are made by the department directly to the teachers on the basis of a single salary schedule which provides higher rates for higher educational qualifications and additional years of teaching experience. Legislation passed in 1947 provided for a salary raise of \$45 a month in rates of teachers' base pay and a monthly bonus of \$18. The bonus was paid throughout 1949. Legislation was enacted changing the time of optional retirement from age 60 to age 55 or after 30 years of service.

Support of special projects.—The biennial appropriation of the department of public instruction includes not only an amount for meeting general costs of education, but includes also funds for supplementary educational programs such as dental hygiene, transportation to school centers, aid to the blind, and maintenance of crippled children whose parents have been unable to keep them in school. The total amount spent for these auxiliary services in 1948-49 was \$749,805.

There were 86 kindergarten classes in the islands last year. The 1949 legislature provided for the addition of 104 new kindergartens, 51 to be added in 1949-50, and 53 more the following year. Kindergartens were made a permanent part of the school system in zones throughout the Territory where 15 or more children resided, age 5 to the age of admittance to grade 1. Earmarked for this expansion of the program was \$347,064 for personal services, \$46,500 for other current expenses, and \$83,200 for equipment. The 1949 legislature appropriated \$25,000 for the department of public instruction to maintain, operate, and expand the program for adult education; this program was authorized by the previous legislative sessions.

A law passed in 1945 appropriated \$38,400 annually beginning with the school year 1945-46 for the provision of dental hygiene instruction and the employment of dental hygienists in the public schools.

Although the furnishing of textbooks is an obligation of parents and guardians, the department is authorized to maintain a system of rentals of textbooks in all public schools, charging from \$1 to \$5 a year for the service. All fees collected from such book rentals are kept in a special fund by the principal of each school under bond. The legislature in 1935 authorized two counties to purchase school books for use of elementary-school children without charge. The county of Kauai now pays book rental fees in the jurisdiction. The Territory is not authorized to make any expenditures for textbooks for free distribution.

Vocational teachers are paid according to the regular salary schedule for all teachers, expenditures being made for regular vocational education instructors from the general fund as a part of the costs of instruction; special adjustments may be made at the discretion of the department of public instruction for longer hours and added responsibilities. A vocational revolving fund, known as the special vocational fund, has been created to receive any reimbursements for vocational education expenditures received from the Federal Government, any moneys received from the sale of products of vocational classes and any other moneys specifically designed for the purpose of this fund. The fund is used for payment of part-time evening teachers, for training of vocational teachers, expenses of holding vocational conferences, and for the payment of such portions of the salaries of vocational teachers for which the Territory will be reimbursed by the Federal Government. In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, the Federal funds for vocational education instruction granted to the Territory amounted to \$165,000.

Vocational rehabilitation program expenditures are included in the expenditures for auxiliary services.

The legislature also provided, through an authorized bond fund, the sum of \$7,650,000 for new school buildings during the 1949-51 biennium.

TABLE 2.—*Expenditures of Territorial funds for schools, 1948-49*

Type of percent of aid	Basis of distribution	Amount
1. General support (94.2 percent):		
(a) Administration.....	Administrative positions authorized by statute for biennial period.	\$379, 756
(b) Instruction.....	Single salary schedule.....	11, 896, 450
2. Support of special projects (5.8 percent): (a) Auxiliary services.....	Supplementary educational services authorized by statute, comprising eight separate programs such as pupil guidance and dental health education, instruction costs and equipment are included.	749, 805
(Items 1 plus 2 equal 100 percent.)		
Total.....		13, 026, 011

¹ Territorial funds only; does not include \$341,761 for other current expenses and equipment, operation and maintenance of special school plants, operation and maintenance of special outlay for special Territorial school services. Total Territorial expenditures were \$13,367,772. Other expenditures were: Federal, \$213,310, and county, \$2,579,720; total school expenditures for Hawaii were \$16,160,802.

Governor STAINBACK. I believe that we are—I do not like to say second to none, but certainly we rank as a better State for education. We have a very fine school system, we have very fine teachers there as a whole. They are well qualified and are very efficient.

Now I want to say that the Hawaiian people are skilled in self-government. I pointed out that we have had constitutional government for over 100 years of a certain type, a constitution under the monarchy, a constitution under the provisional government, a constitution under the republic, and a constitution under our own Territorial organization under the organic act.

The legislature has exercised general legislative power, subject only to the restrictions of the organic act and the United States Constitution.

The people have shown a keen interest in public affairs with a larger percentage of registered voters voting in elections than in any State in the Union. We go up to 85 percent.

I made a study of this in the presidential election in 1948. I was rather interested in predicting elections and I noticed that the highest vote I believe in any State in the Union was something like 70 percent. Most of them were 60 or 50, I believe, and we have gone to higher than 80 percent in almost every election.

As long ago as 1937, a congressional committee found that "Hawaii has fulfilled every requirement for statehood heretofore exacted of Territories," but recommended a plebiscite of the voters be held. Such a plebiscite was held in 1940, with two-thirds of the votes for statehood. Of course the war came on after that.

The second largest vote in Hawaii's history on March 21 elected a combination of political veterans and novices to write its State constitution. I believe some 80 percent of the voters voted in this election.

Senator CORDON. What was the percentage of the vote on the statehood plebiscite, Governor, if you know?

Governor STAINBACK. I do not know offhand. I can check up on that and find out. I am informed it is 85 percent. I will find out more definitely. I am not sure.

The CHAIRMAN. The information available to the chairman would indicate that the 1946 plebiscite showed 46,174 votes for statehood and 22,428 against. Are those your figures, Governor?

Secretary CHAPMAN. About 2-to-1 was the vote in favor of it.

Governor STAINBACK. I have here 87,000 voters. Barely under 80 percent of those eligible to vote turned out to register their choice.

The CHAIRMAN. The total vote for and against amounted to 68,602. What percentage is that of the total eligible vote?

Governor STAINBACK. At that time I do not know what it was. I will have to check up on that.

Secretary CHAPMAN. We will get that figure for you, Senator, as to what number was eligible to vote, the year that they voted on the plebiscite, and what number voted. We will get that for you. You ought to have that.

(The following was subsequently furnished in reply to the request above:)

EXHIBIT 13. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION ¹

Official tabulation—Results of votes cast, statehood plebiscite, Territory of Hawaii, held Tuesday, Nov. 5, 1940

Summary

Districts.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
Voters registered.....	12,477	4,787	11,952	28,307	22,063	7,735	87,321
Votes cast.....	10,616	3,991	10,198	24,168	18,930	6,635	74,538
Yes.....	6,950	2,724	6,676	13,741	11,623	4,460	46,174
No.....	2,861	923	2,731	8,645	5,599	1,669	22,428
Not voting.....	485	199	571	1,028	882	290	3,455
Ballots rejected.....	352	143	362	766	804	218	2,645

NOTE.—85.3 percent of the registered voters cast their ballots in the 1940 plebiscite.

¹ Statehood for Hawaii, hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Territories, House of Representatives, 79th Cong., 2d sess., pursuant to H. Res. 236. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1946) p. 725.

Governor STAINBACK. The Territory is a modern unit with an economic, social, and political status of the highest order. It is and has been for many years entirely self-supporting, paying all the expenses of the Territory and county governments, except the salaries of the legislators and those officers appointed by the President. I might add when I came before the House committee a number of years ago they were rather surprised by the fact that we asked nothing from the Federal Government in the way of grants of various sorts.

Now we come to Hawaii's war record. In December 1941, came the outbreak of World War II, with an attack on Hawaii. The Territory had set up a full-scale organization for civilian defense which went into immediate action on December 7. Now I digress to say that Hawaii's record was very little known at the time of attack, particularly the record of the civilians.

I think you, Senator, found out there quite a bit of what was going on, but on the mainland there was no publicity at the time concerning the fact that in less than 2 hours after the attack, civilian first-aid units, well-equipped, and well-staffed, were in active service. Women of the Territory had organized themselves into units and had saved the lives of a great many people. They had organized blood banks but you heard nothing about that on the mainland at the time. It

may have been due to censorship, but it is a record that I think is an outstanding record not only in civilian preparedness but in efficiency of service.

The civilian defense also had on hand a blood bank which saved the lives of hundreds of our wounded soldiers and sailors. Not only that, but our doctors who were in special session at that time went out as a unit and saved the lives of a great many soldiers and sailors.

The record of Hawaii throughout the dark days that followed December 7 bespeaks the loyalty, fortitude, and energy of its people. When the history of that period is written, the activities of the civilian volunteers, men and women, will be a record of which Hawaii may be justly proud.

Our citizens of every race and every color also served in the armed services, Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, in the merchant marine, and in war work of every kind and description. The roll of Hawaii's honored dead throughout the world is proof positive of the loyalty of Hawaii's sons and their patriotism was not measured by the color of their skins.

Our population, tested by the fire of battle and trials of war, both at home and abroad, were not found wanting.

I am emphasizing that because the war threw more light upon the loyalty and patriotism of our population than the many preceding years of peace, and settled for all time a question that had been the cause of concern to many sincere democratic citizens who honestly questioned whether children of non-Caucasian parents, of alien cultures, of alien religions, of many races, could be truly knit by a common idealism into a nation.

The situation in Hawaii had no precedent in the old States where the alien population in such States had the same religions, customs, habits, and ways of thinking, more or less common with that of the citizens. No State had had to absorb and deal with a large group of Asiatic aliens who could not be naturalized under our existing laws and whose very religions in many cases were foreign and strange to us.

However, during the years preceding the war there had been tremendous changes in our population since annexation, changes climaxed by the war. Our public schools, our Boy and Girl Scout organizations, and all of our free and democratic institutions had been gradually but efficiently Americanizing each of the coming generations.

I might tell you here a little incident that I heard of some years ago in the Royal School. They were questioning some children and one of the little oriental pupils spoke of our Pilgrim ancestors. Now that shows the true Americanizing. They were ancestors of this little Japanese boy because in spirit he had received the democracy that these people have established in America, so that when he speaks of our Pilgrim ancestors, you might smile but it is a pretty true statement of the situation as we view it in Hawaii.

Hawaii proved to be truly a melting pot with much more than a third of its marriages interracial. From the last statistics I got several years ago, 22 percent of the women of Japanese ancestry married into other races, possibly due to a good many of our soldiers being there.

This is especially conspicuous among the Japanese for, at the time of annexation, marriage among the Japanese people outside of their

own race was almost unheard of; in the meantime our percentage of citizenship population had increased from less than 40 percent to more than 85 percent. That will compare with most of the States of the Union, particularly the States settled by large immigration from Europe in recent years.

As stated, the war removed all doubt of the thorough Americanization of our peoples of all races. In this connection, I call to your attention that Hawaii not only furnished its quota under selective service, but by voluntary enlistment it raised a battalion of infantry among those of Japanese descent which finished the war with an outstanding record and was one of if not the most decorated units of the American Army. In fact, I believe their decoration outnumbered the actual number in the regiment, so it showed that these people of alien religions, of alien culture, had been thoroughly Americanized in the love of liberty and freedom, and even though their religion may be Buddhist, I have gone into Buddhist temples and talked. They love freedom of religion, freedom of action, just as much as any Christian, as far as I have been able to see. As I say, I have made several speeches in Buddhist temples out there, and have been glad and proud to do so.

The geographical position is no bar to statehood. With modern means of transportation and communication, our geographic position is no deterrent. We are closer to Washington today than Boston was at the time of the formation of the Union. The last time I went back to Honolulu I got there in less than 24 hours after leaving Washington. We are certainly much closer than Texas, California, or other Western Territories were at the time of their admission as States. The people of Hawaii are as well informed on national affairs and in as close touch with their fellow citizens as if the Territory were a contiguous area. I might add that Honolulu is very much closer to Washington than Washington is to Hawaii. I write, put a stamp on the letter and it gets back in a day or two, but people putting an ordinary stamp on the letter might have a long time getting a reply, so we are very close to Washington but Washington may be a little further from us.

For example, our papers receive wire services of all leading news-gathering agencies, carry the articles of most nationally known columnists, and two well-known news weeklies appear on the stands here the same day as on the mainland.

Now concerning disadvantages of territoriality, observers pointing to the remarkable progress made by Hawaii since annexation, have been known to say, "You seem to have done all right as a Territory; why change?" This overlooks the fact that the progress of these islands has been made in spite of the disadvantages of the Territorial status and also under this status Congress may modify or completely repeal the Territorial Organic Act. In fact, we had recent attempts or suggestions from certain individuals to place the Territory of Hawaii under naval or military control; so, obviously, even our existing rights of local self-government can be secured only by statehood.

I remember when I was first appointed Governor, one of my biggest fights was to try to maintain constitutional government in Hawaii and to try to prevent the military from taking over complete government of the islands.

Secretary CHAPMAN. And you won, by the way, in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Governor STAINBACK. But equally important with the security of existing rights of local self-government, is a representation in national affairs. It is difficult to secure due consideration from the National Government with merely a voice in the House of Representatives and neither voice nor vote in the Senate. There are numerous instances of legislation by the Congress which have discriminated against Hawaii. When Smith-Hughes funds for the aid of vocational education were provided by Congress in 1917, Hawaii was omitted; not until a special act was passed by Congress in 1924 was Hawaii able to receive Federal vocation allocations. The same is true of Federal aid for roads. The Jones-Costigan Act in 1934 discriminated against Hawaii in allocating sugar quotas. Other instances could be cited.

I do not want you gentlemen to misunderstand me. Congress has always been friendly, cordial, and helpful when matters are brought to their attention. They have leaned over backwards in being fair. I have appeared before congressional committees for the last 15 years, House and Senate, but you gentlemen are busy men taking care of your own interests, your own States, and watching legislation. You have large staffs that are necessary.

How can Hawaii keep up with legislation or know what is going on here when there is nobody to sit in the Senate to raise his voice? We do not know a lot of the legislation. For instance, to give you one example, I did not know that we were entitled to certain benefits available. Nobody from Hawaii had taken advantage of them under this Patman-Robinson Act. Just by accident, soon after I became Governor, I found out that we were entitled to a considerable fund to aid Hawaii in the establishment of game. Well, if we had had somebody back here on the job in the Senate when it was actually passed, we would have known about it years ago and would have taken advantage of it.

It is true with other things. I am not criticizing the Congress at all, because we have no representation. When we show you what you have done, you go out of your way. I have never found the attitude of any Congress any different that I have appeared before.

Senator CORDON. May I interrupt a moment, Governor, to suggest that even though you were permitted as a Territory to representation in the Congress and in the Senate, if you did not have all of the rights of statehood, that representations in my humble judgment would not be sufficient to give to the Territory of Hawaii the protection that the State of Hawaii would get solely because of statehood.

Governor STAINBACK. I do not know that there is any question on that. I am coming to that a little later. I think we need more than a voice. The fact that the discrimination may not have been intended does not make the penalty less severe, and the hazard that it will be repeated remains as long as Hawaii is denied the rights and powers of a State.

Most of the discrimination has been cured after a period of 2. 4 or 6 years, but in the meantime not all of it has been cured. We have no voice in national affairs. As I pointed out, thousands of young men of these islands were drafted during World War II though neither they nor their parents had any voice in the passage of the Draft Act, nor vote in the declaration of war which sent them into battle.

The citizens of Hawaii pay Federal taxes on exactly the same basis as do the citizens of a State, yet they have no vote either in the levying of the taxes or in the disbursing of the revenues.

These conditions are contrary to traditional American principles. No taxation without representation, no government without the consent of the governed, are axioms as much alive and as important to the people of Hawaii today as they were to the Revolutionary father who first gave them utterance, and these principles are particularly applicable when we remember that the overwhelming mass of the residents of Hawaii are citizens of the United States, citizens whose loyalty, patriotism, and ability in self-government cannot be questioned.

Now there has been this talk about communism and I think I have led the fight down there and I have had a fight to convince a lot of people in Washington that there was a "commie" in a carload, but I said that the recent constitutional convention election has shown beyond any doubt that those who are known or strongly suspected of being Communists will be repudiated by the voters. The recent investigation of the Un-American Activities Committee into Communist infiltration activities in the Territory has made known the chief figures in the Communist Party in Hawaii and thus has rendered the Territory a great service that should have a favorable effect on statehood, because as the Secretary says, as soon as we know them, we kick them out. In that connection, I may say that in some of the districts that were strongholds of this political party, some of the suspected Reds were repudiated. That was the case with the man who ran last in one of those districts. It was mainly because he had been associated and more or less classed with the Reds. That was not a single isolated instance.

There were two cases, one not even suspected of being a Red, Kageyama, the other man from Hawaii fairly well known at least among those who were known as Communists. He was expelled immediately by the constitutional convention. As the Secretary pointed out, they only need to be known to be cast out, and I believe we can do a job on that.

Senator CORDON. May I interrupt you again, Governor. Will you agree with me that the higher level of restraint and discipline which the people of Hawaii showed under the strain of the recent strike and their action when their legislative body was called to protect the interests of the people of Hawaii, was perhaps an adequate answer to a charge of communistic influence as any people could make?

Governor STAINBACK. I do not believe there is any State in the Union that has shown such determination as Hawaii has to settle for itself its right to continued economic existence. Hawaii was patient, Hawaii was long trying, and you cannot imagine what we had to go through with the strike down there.

The leaders were from the mainland and chiefly the California man who has recently been convicted, and we hope adequately disposed of for all time to come as far as Hawaii is concerned.

Senator BUTLER. Governor, I want to add my hearty approval of you and the way the others in the island did everything you could to take care of the Communist situation that developed out there in the last year. I do not know whether you and the others will get the award to which you are entitled, which is plenty, but in that connection, however, I wonder if you knew that the man from California

who was really the leader still controls the unions not only in Hawaii but within the last few days, although they have been expelled from the CIO, they have reorganized and are now under the supervision of Harry Bridges not only in Hawaii but along the western coast, including all of the unions of Alaska.

GOVERNOR STAINBACK. I did not know that the CIO had thrown them out. I knew it was one of the unions they were going to throw out.

I made mention a couple of years ago that I spoke to Phil Murray about the situation out there, and I think they can take that up. I asked Mr. Beck a few months ago whether he would organize in opposition to Harry Bridges' outfit. I do not know—he may have been down to enjoy the climate. Mr. Beck, as I understand, is a thorough 100 percent American.

I do not know what the ILWU will do. A very small part of our people are Communists and mostly controlled from the California Bridges-Goldblatt-Schmidt set-up, who are all apparently enrolled, active Communists.

It may be and I hope that the men in Hawaii, in the Union, will elect their own union and throw out this control from California. That is a hopeful position, and certainly we are no worse off than the California phase of the set-up, as far as Communist control is concerned.

Senator ECRON. How large is the union membership?

GOVERNOR STAINBACK. About 35,000 in Hawaii. They have transportation, sugar, and pineapple. It is a large union. I think Hawaii is Bridges' richest province in the way of contributing funds, so naturally he has tried to hold onto it.

Senator BUTLER. The ILWU, I am told, is more numerous than all of his others combined that he has taken in, including all of the unions connected with fisheries in Alaska.

GOVERNOR STAINBACK. I am not prepared to know what his other unions consist of. They claim 35,000 in Hawaii. I doubt if it is that large. There are 22,000 sugar workers, about 2,000 longshoremens. In pineapple there are seven or eight thousand. There may be somewhere between thirty and thirty-five thousand in his union.

As to Hawaii's place in the Pacific, Hawaii is the natural center of the Nation's Pacific affairs. Statehood for Hawaii would increase its prestige among the peoples whose countries border on the Pacific, particularly the people of the Orient. This in turn would benefit the Nation. Just as Americans of Italian ancestry have influenced the thinking of the Italian people, so Americans of oriental ancestry can influence the thinking of the peoples of the Orient—Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos. They cannot do this as effectively while they remain second-class citizens. Admission of Hawaii as a State would be an affirmation by the Nation of its belief in the people of Hawaii, and would demonstrate to the people of the Orient that under our Constitution self-government is for people of every race and creed.

I might say here that you Senators are dissipating a feeling of racial discrimination against the oriental races in the United States by this recent bill, which will remove the bars to naturalization of orientals otherwise qualified. It passed the House, and I understand it has the full support of the Senate committee. I do not know whether it has passed or not, but I think that will be an excellent step, together with others.

The time for statehood is now. As previously stated, a Territorial government is a transitory one, tolerable for a reasonable period but should be endured no longer than is necessary to show that the people of the Territory are loyal citizens of the United States and capable of self-government.

The time has come. The House of Representatives has so decided. The President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior have endorsed statehood for Hawaii, the Legislature of Hawaii has petitioned for it, the people of Hawaii have voted for State government, and public opinion is overwhelmingly in favor of statehood for Hawaii.

We petition the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to report favorably on our bill to grant statehood to Hawaii.

Senator BUTLER. I am interested in the statement about the action lately by the House and Senate committees with reference to making orientals eligible for citizenship. I want to state that has my hearty approval, that we in Nebraska have quite a number of orientals, both Chinese and Japanese origin, who are among our leading citizens.

The youth rank high in our schools and they are leaders in the foreign clubs, so anything that happens in connection with this hearing or any remark I make with reference to statehood for Hawaii which might be interpreted as opposing it, I want you and the people of Hawaii to understand that it does not come from any idea that I am opposed to orientals.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions to be addressed to the Governor?

Governor, you will be here, will you not, during the remainder of these hearings?

Governor STAINBACK. May I be excused this afternoon? I have an engagement this afternoon with a very important person, the President. I will be back tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. Very good.

Secretary CHAPMAN. He will be here tomorrow and as long as the hearings continue.

The CHAIRMAN. Our next witness will be Assistant Secretary Hickerson.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I make one more statement to clarify the record?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, indeed.

Secretary CHAPMAN. In your absence, Senator Anderson admirably handled the hearings on Alaska, but I want to call to your attention one fact: That we had General Twining, who was the general in charge of the military program in Alaska, who happened to be in the city at that time and did come forward to testify.

I talked with the Defense Establishment Friday, and they indicated that the admiral in charge of the Hawaiian area was not in the city and that they would try to get him here if you need further testimony from the military point of view. Of course, the admiral in charge actually is the better man to testify on details of that, but they felt that Secretary Johnson's letter might be adequate, but if it was not to let them know. I told them I would give you that information.

I want to clarify one other statement. I told you that a half-million acres of land was involved in this public-land transfer or the public-land discussion of Hawaii. That will depend upon how and what disposition is made of certain military reservations, both Army and

Navy, as to what acres are turned back to the Hawaiian Government, and then it would be added to this 500,000 that I have spoken to you about. It would vary according to the number of acres that would be turned back.

We have, as you know, a national park in Hawaii, which would not be involved in this, but you do have many acres of land involved in military reservations, both in the Army and Navy, and the final disposition of those lands has not yet been determined, that is, when or if they would release it at all. They might release it at some time in the future.

Senator BUTLER. If those should become public lands, what would the total be?

Secretary CHAPMAN. It would depend on how many acres would be returned. It would be approximately a million acres of land. It would depend upon how many of those acres they would turn back to the State of Hawaii to add to the 500,000 to which I have referred.

That is what it would amount to. I wanted to clarify the record on that, that there is some question as to the exact acreage we are talking about here; that will have to be clarified as it goes along on that basis.

I have one thing further. Since Senator Anderson was in charge of the last hearing and heard Governor Warren, of California, testify, I want you to know for the sake of this record and for this hearing, even though it was stated very specifically that his testimony would be broken down and inserted into this record as endorsing statehood for Hawaii, I want the chairman to know that the Governor of California stated categorically that he himself was for statehood for Hawaii. He did not wish it to be annexed to California on any basis that he could think of.

Second, he added that the governors' conference had unanimously passed a resolution recommending statehood for Hawaii.

I wanted you to know that, Mr. Chairman, since you happened to be absent that particular day. I wanted the record to be clear, although I am sure it will be in the record when Governor Warren's testimony is presented.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the record also be clear that although the chairman was absent from the meetings, he was following the presentation of the evidence.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I know you were, Senator, I am sure you were.

STATEMENT OF HON. EARL WARREN, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

NOTE: The testimony of Governor Warren, when he appeared before the committee on April 24, 1950, with reference to Alaska statehood, is inserted herein in its entirety at his request.

Senator ANDERSON. Now, Governor Warren, if time permits, I would like to give personal testimony to the nice way in which you treat members of the Government when they come to California, and particularly to your courtesy to me when I was out there as Secretary of Agriculture. We are very happy to have you with us this morning and will be glad to hear anything you have to say on this question of statehood for Alaska. If you find it inconvenient to be back here the following week to tell us anything you desire about Hawaii, if you wish at this time to add anything you have to say about Hawaii, the door is open for you to add that additional material this morning, if you desire to do so.

STATEMENT OF HON. EARL WARREN, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Governor WARREN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee. That is very generous of you, and I appreciate it, because I am under commitment to be in Sacramento tomorrow morning at the opening of business.

I apologize for not having a written statement, but I do not propose to offer any statistics, because I am not here as an expert on the economy of Alaska, I am not here as an expert on the defense of Alaska, nor am I familiar with the details of H. R. 331. I am appearing here as a neighbor, from a neighboring State, a State that is friendly to Alaska and that is hopeful for the opportunities that it may have in the future. I am also appearing as a westerner who happens at the moment to be chairman of a governors' conference of the 11 Western States, which organization has gone on record several times during the past few years in favor of statehood for Alaska.

We in the West believe that the development of any part of the West is of great benefit to the entire West, and we consider Alaska as an integral part of the West. We have had the association of its Governor in the council of the Governors' Conference Committee 5 or 6 years, and we have come to believe that this is the time for Alaska to be given statehood.

We believe that we have a particular interest in the defense of Alaska, and we believe that if Alaska is given statehood, is given an opportunity to develop its resources and its civilization, that it will be a greater factor in the defense of our Nation than it could otherwise be. We believe, in the last analysis, the defense of Alaska will come from the civilization that we develop there rather than just from the airplanes that we send there, or the fortifications that we develop. We are of the opinion that Alaska will not develop to the fullest extent of its potentialities unless it does achieve statehood.

We believe that no Territory of this country that is owned, more than 98 percent, by the Government and managed by it, by bureaus as far away as Washington is from Alaska, can give the people the opportunity to develop in accordance with American principles and ideals.

We believe that this is a particularly significant time, so far as the development of Alaska is concerned, because it is the outpost of our civilization, it is the outpost of our democracy, and we fervently believe that if people are encouraged to go to Alaska and develop its resources that we can make that portion of our country more secure than could otherwise possibly be done.

We believe that statehood will increase the population of Alaska much faster than it has developed in the past. While we are interested in the welfare of Alaska, we are also interested in our own welfare, and we believe that the development of Alaska will help our economy. We believe that the more people there are there, the more trade they have, the more we will share in it and the better it will be for our people.

We believe that it is only justice for the people of Alaska that they be admitted into the Union of the States. For 83 years Americans have lived in Alaska, and for the last 38 years they have lived under a Territorial government. The people have served in two wars, they have served faithfully and loyally, they have paid the taxes that our Government has imposed upon them, and we believe that they have earned statehood in every sense of the word.

On the question of the population, I want to say that Alaska has more people now than my own State had when it was admitted to the Union 100 years ago.

Senator CORDON. May I also suggest, Mr. Governor, that at the time your State was admitted it also was noncontiguous with another State?

Governor WARREN. Yes, sir. Senator, I was about to say that, and also to point out that I left San Francisco yesterday afternoon at half past four by the fastest mode of transportation that we have, arriving here at 9:30 this morning, and I could have gotten to southern Alaska quicker than I could have gotten to Washington by the same mode of transportation. So we do not feel that the distance out there on the Pacific coast is material to this issue. We are used to distances, and we believe that the great distances in the West represent a great part of its strength.

So we feel that the people of Alaska have earned the right to statehood, and we believe they have earned the right to full development under statehood.

Now, there are always those who view with alarm the distance that the West has been from the Atlantic coast whenever a new State sought admission to the Union, and even some very famous men, men of this Senate, have expressed that alarm in times gone by. I happened to run across a statement of Daniel Webster in the United States Senate just a little over 100 years ago, in which statement he said this:

"What can we do with the western coast? A coast of 3,000 miles, rock-bound, cheerless, uninviting, and not a harbor on it. I will never vote 1 cent from the Public Treasury to place the Pacific Ocean 1 inch nearer Boston than it is now" (laughter).

Senator ANDERSON. Governor, I will say to you I used that quotation some time ago, and the Library of Congress told me Daniel Webster never said that. I think both of us ought to check it.

Governor WARREN. I quoted it from what I considered was good authority.

Senator ANDERSON. I took it on the best authority that I thought there was in the world. I hope it is true, but I just was not able to find it as yet. You do recognize it is typical of the thinking of a great many people 100 years ago.

Governor WARREN. Yes, and perhaps some people today, and I say that without intending to give any offense.

I am sure Alaska seems a great deal farther away to many people in our country than any of the European countries, and perhaps some of the Asiatic countries, but really it is not far away. I believe it can be integrated with the other States in the Union, and I am also of the opinion that it will never develop to its full potentialities and possibilities until it does have the same opportunities for self-government that the other people in the United States have.

I believe this is the time for us to integrate our policy on the self-determination of people, and inasmuch as these people have lived there for a period of 83 years under our sovereignty and for 38 years as a Territory and fulfilled every obligation that has been put upon them, it seems to me a matter of common justice that they should be admitted to statehood and should stand in the way of totalitarianism spreading its influence from the Eastern Hemisphere into the Western Hemisphere. I think, if given statehood, the people of Alaska would measure up to that responsibility.

I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

If I might just say a word now on the question of Hawaii, because I must return to California.

Senator ANDERSON. May I ask you just this question?

Governor WARREN. Yes, Senator.

Senator ANDERSON. Has the Council of Western State Governors to which you referred adopted officially resolutions on the question of statehood for either Alaska or Hawaii?

Governor WARREN. They have adopted officially resolutions favoring both.

Senator ANDERSON. Both?

Governor WARREN. Yes, sir.

Senator ANDERSON. Would you supply for the record copies of those resolutions?

Governor WARREN. Yes, sir.

Senator ANDERSON. Thank you.

The resolutions adopted by the Governors' Conference are as follows:

July 13-16, 1947.

XIV. STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The people of Hawaii have at the ballot box expressed their desire to achieve statehood. Hawaii is one of the two incorporated Territories of the United States for which statehood, following American tradition and precedent, is clearly indicated as their destiny. Hawaii has been under the American flag for 49 years and has, therefore, undergone a period of preparation and tutelage far longer than that of most Territories, before they achieved statehood. The expressed wish of our own fellow citizens of Hawaii is merely for the fulfillment of the moderate, understandable, traditional, and legitimate aspiration to achieve full equality and responsibility in the family of States and for self-government according to the established American pattern.

Therefore, the Governors' Conference hereby expresses its sympathy with the recorded desire for statehood of the people of Hawaii, and endorses the passage of suitable legislation by the Congress to achieve that end.

June 13-16, 1948.

IX. STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

The Governors' Conference hereby reiterates its sympathy with the recorded desire for statehood of the people of Alaska and Hawaii, and endorses the passage of suitable legislation by the Congress to achieve that end.

June 19-22, 1949.

X. STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

The Governors' Conference urges the Congress promptly to enact enabling legislation to admit Alaska and Hawaii to statehood.

IV. STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

(Resolution adopted by the Western Governors' Conference, Salt Lake City, Utah, November 7-8, 1949)

The last three National Governors' Conferences have adopted resolutions urging the admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood.

Since in two successive Congresses, the Eightieth and the Eighty-first, the committees to which were referred the bills providing statehood for the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii have reported favorably thereon, the Conference of Western Governors now urges the Congress to act on this legislation at the coming session and speed the admission of the forty-ninth and fiftieth States.

Governor WARREN. While I am not chairman of the National Conference, it also has adopted resolutions recommending statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii.

Senator ANDERSON. If there is no objection, we will hear the Governor at this time on Hawaii also.

Senator BUTLER. While their resolution was on the question of statehood for Hawaii, it was not on H. R. 331.

Governor WARREN. That is true.

Senator BUTLER. There is a vast difference between the two, you understand that.

Governor WARREN. Yes.

Senator BUTLER. I am strong for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, under proper conditions, but I do not think they are getting anything like a fair deal under H. R. 331. Of course, I am open to conviction. Maybe the Governor over there can convert me before we are through taking his statement.

Governor WARREN. No, Senator; our resolutions were directed to statehood for Alaska and Hawaii now, not at some distant date in the future. We are for statehood now. As to the terms and conditions of the admission, we have little knowledge and have nothing to urge at this particular time.

Senator ECTON. Mr. Governor, may I ask you if your conference made any recommendations as to the provisions under which Alaska should be admitted as a State?

Governor WARREN. No; we did not. I can say to your, from a discussion with all of the members of the conference, that it was hoped that it would be under conditions that were most favorable to a State, a new State that would have a very hard job to do, and certainly on terms equal to those that have heretofore been granted to other States as they were admitted to the Union.

Senator ECTON. Thank you.

Senator LEHMAN. Governor, may I ask you this question. I want to emphasize that resolution of the National Conference of Governors, of which I was a member for a great many years, is pretty significant, because it is not just one of these hurried resolutions that are acted upon after 5 minutes' consideration. Those resolutions are first submitted and discussed by the executive committee, and then a statement is made to the entire conference, so they did receive very careful consideration.

Governor WARREN. Yes. It so happens, Senator, that I was both on the executive committee and on the resolutions committee, and I know that is true, and that it was considered very seriously by the executive committee and at the conference itself. The resolutions committee gave a great deal of time to the consideration of these resolutions.

Senator LEHMAN. That was my question. Thank you.

Senator ANDERSON. How unanimous was their action? Was it close or overwhelming?

Governor WARREN. It was unanimous, Senator, because we have the rule in the governors' conference, both in our national conference and in our western conference, that we do not adopt resolutions unless they are unanimous.

Senator ANDERSON. That would be a very good rule to have here.

Governor WARREN. The reason for that is because there is so much diversity of opinion, the country is so complex, and unless we can arrive at a unanimous conclusion we do not think it would serve any great purpose.

Senator ANDERSON. Thank you for your statement.

Now, if you will proceed with the question of Hawaii.

Governor WARREN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me everything that I have said concerning Alaska could well be said concerning Hawaii, and I can add to that also the fact that California has been particularly close to Hawaii for a great many years, and we feel our economic relations and our social relations with the Islands at this time, and for many years in the past, have been just as close as with any of the States of the Union, and much closer than with many of the States of the Union.

We believe that Hawaii, having been a Territory for 52 years and having been an outpost for this country during two wars, and having served faithfully in both of those wars, has earned statehood, if it is possible for any people to earn statehood.

We believe that the Islands have the resources and the ability to take care of themselves, and having paid into the United States Treasury, as I am informed, much more than they have ever received from it, they are well able to govern themselves, to finance themselves in every respect.

We believe that a half million people in those Islands to be deprived of full citizenship for any greater length of time would be an injustice to them and would be a reflection upon the integration of the principles that we have expressed in the United Nations, and otherwise. In California we feel very earnestly that Hawaii should be admitted to the Union at the earliest possible day.

Senator ANDERSON. Are there any questions of Governor Warren by any members of the committee?

Senator BUTLER. Governor, I just have one question.

Governor WARREN. Yes, sir.

Senator BUTLER. I have the impression that there would be very little opposition, if any, to the admission of Hawaii to statehood as a part of California.

Governor WARREN. Well, Senator Butler, we are pretty aggressive out there in California in a lot of ways, but I never have heard California express the desire to take Hawaii into the territorial limits of California.

Senator BUTLER. Well, they are fine people.

Governor WARREN. I have never heard a public discussion of that in my State, where any Californians have ever advocated that. I feel certain that if it were advocated it would be overwhelmingly repudiated, not because we do not like the people of Hawaii, but because we do not want to force ourselves upon them. We believe it would be unfair to them, we believe they would resent it, and there isn't any reason that we can see why those islands at that distance should become a part of the jurisdiction of any State on the mainland.

Senator BUTLER. The distance you said a while ago was no factor in this matter, and I think so, myself—I agree with you in that—but I do think the economy being built largely around sugar in Hawaii, almost entirely on sugar, and the economy and social relations having been so close over the years, that it would not be a bit different than adding another county down below the southern California line, if that was possible.

Governor WARREN. Senator, a difference for one purpose might be one thing, and for another purpose it might be something entirely different. So far as becoming an integral part of the Union and as one of the States of the Union, it seems to me that the distance between the mainland and Hawaii is insignificant, but when it comes to a question of local government in each of these islands in the Hawaiian group, making them counties of California, it seems to me it would present problems that might be insurmountable.

Senator BUTLER. I do not think it would present any problems that would be insurmountable for the State of California any more than for the United States Government.

Governor WARREN. That is, of course, Senator, local government and on a different footing and representation in a State legislature, which, it seems to me, is on a far more intimate basis and on a far more local basis than representation in the Congress of the United States and in the other agencies of the Government.

Senator ANDERSON. Are there any additional questions? If not, thank you very much, Governor, and if you, or the associations to which you referred, desire to make any supplementary statement, we would be glad to have it.

Senator BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I have just a couple of things to mention.

Senator Millikin is kept from attendance on the committee here because of his rank and his work he has to do in the Finance Committee on H. R. 6000. He wanted that to be in the record.

Senator Watkins is absent from the city.

Senator Malone is detained because of work on another committee.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, when Mr. Hickerson is through with his statement—and I understand it is a brief one—I would like very much to have the Delegate from Hawaii be heard before you close today at noon, if time permits it.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask a question or two, Mr. Secretary, since you have resumed the stand, if Secretary Hickerson will bear with us?

You have made reference to the national park in Hawaii.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Department of the Interior have any opinion to express to this committee at the present time with respect to whether or not as a matter of executive policy of the Department it feels that that park should be retained as a national park or should be turned over to the new State?

Secretary CHAPMAN. Senator, that park was created exactly like every other park, including the Yellowstone National Park, by an act of Congress. It would remain as a national park if statehood was given to Hawaii. Hawaii itself gave us the property. We did not pay for it. So Hawaii would not ask for it back, I am sure. I am very happy to express the opinion that we would wish to have it remain as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Bureau within the Department of the Interior administer any lands in the Territory of Hawaii now?

Secretary CHAPMAN. No, Senator. The Bureau of Land Management has no administrative program actually functioning in Hawaii. Ordinarily—take Alaska for instance—we do have, of course, but the Bureau of Land Management does not have an active program of management in Hawaii of these acres I have referred to here. We do not have any other land action program in Hawaii.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to have you prepare for the record a special statistical table, if you will, Mr. Secretary, with respect to the census of Hawaiians.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I will get that.

The CHAIRMAN. I remember from the hearings which were held in Hawaii some 13 years ago by a joint committee of the House and Senate which went to Hawaii as the guests of the Territory, the legislature, perhaps, of the Territory, that the evidence then seemed to show that there had been a very sharp decline in the number of pure Hawaiians and that there had possibly been some change in trend.

Will you give us the figures by years from the beginning of the total population of Hawaiians, full-blood, and part-blood.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Senator, I will get you the census figures for the last 30 years, which will give you the census population breakdown by racial origin. I will have that presented to you in table form to give you the full information on how those various racial groups have either declined or increased.

The CHAIRMAN. Very good, Mr. Secretary.

(The documents referred to above are as follows:)

*Population of Hawaii by race, 1896-1950*¹

Race	1896 ²		1900 ³		1910 ⁴		1920 ⁴		1930 ⁴		1940 ⁴		1950 ⁵	
	Popula- tion	Per- cent	Popula- tion	Per- cent	Popula- tion	Per- cent	Popula- tion	Per- cent	Popula- tion	Per- cent	Popula- tion	Per- cent	Popula- tion	Per- cent
Hawaiian ³	31,019	28.5	28,718	18.6	26,041	13.6	23,723	9.3	22,636	6.1	14,375	3.4	10,500	2.0
Part-Hawaiian ³	8,485	7.8	9,536	6.2	12,506	6.5	18,027	7.0	28,224	7.6	49,935	11.8	74,941	14.2
Caucasian.....	22,438	20.6	26,252	17.1	39,158	20.4	49,140	19.3	73,702	20.0	103,791	24.5	157,115	29.8
Chinese.....	21,616	19.8	25,782	16.7	31,674	11.3	23,507	9.2	27,179	7.4	38,774	6.8	31,173	5.9
Japanese.....	24,407	22.4	61,115	39.7	79,675	41.5	109,274	42.7	139,631	37.9	157,905	37.3	181,198	34.4
Korean.....	—	—	—	—	4,533	2.4	4,950	1.9	6,461	1.8	6,851	1.6	7,415	1.4
Filipino.....	—	—	—	—	2,361	1.2	21,031	8.2	63,052	17.1	82,969	12.4	53,036	10.0
Puerto Rican.....	—	—	—	—	4,890	2.5	5,602	2.2	6,671	1.8	8,296	2.0	10,182	1.9
Negro.....	—	—	—	—	695	.4	348	.1	563	.2	255	.1	(6)	—
Other.....	1,055	.9	2,618	1.7	376	.2	310	.1	217	.1	579	.1	1,913	.4
Total.....	109,020	100.0	154,001	100.0	191,909	100.0	255,912	100.0	388,336	100.0	423,330	100.0	527,473	100.0

¹ See exhibit 21, Statehood for Hawaii, hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Territories, House of Representatives, 79th Cong., 2d sess., Pursuant to H. Res. 236. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1946), p. 655.

² Corrected figures, from the work of Dr. Romanzo Adams. See the record of the 1937 hearings before the Joint Committee on Hawaii, 75th Cong., 2d sess., p. 440.

³ Census figures, except that the number of Hawaiians and Part-Hawaiians has been corrected in accordance with the 1937 report of the Joint Committee on Hawaii, S. Doc. No. 151, 75th Cong., 3d sess., p. 38.

⁴ Census figures.

⁵ Estimate of civilians only, Bureau of Health Statistics, Territorial Department of Health, Jan. 1, 1950.

⁶ Included in "Other" for 1950.

**STATEMENT OF JOHN D. HICKERSON, ASSISTANT SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF STATE IN CHARGE OF UNITED NATIONS
AFFAIRS**

Mr. HICKERSON. My name, Mr. Chairman, is John D. Hickerson. I am an Assistant Secretary of State. My particular work in the State Department is supervising the Bureau of United Nations Affairs.

May I at the outset say that although we know you followed the hearings of last week, how delighted I am that you are able to be back and preside at this hearing.

Now, my statement, sir, will be very brief. You have in your records the letter from the Department of State dated April 20, 1950, supporting this legislation to make Hawaii a State. I shall supplement that briefly by saying that we feel that the admission of Hawaii to the Union would be in fulfillment of our obligation under the Charter of the United Nations. I refer specifically, sir, to chapter XI of the Charter, the declaration regarding non-self-governing territories.

In particular, I call attention to the fact that among the obligations accepted by the United States and applicable to Hawaii as well as to Alaska, is the obligation, and I quote:

to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions. * * *

It is the view of the Department of State that the enactment of legislation to provide statehood for Hawaii would be in fulfillment of this obligation and would accordingly serve to support American foreign policy and strengthen the position of the United States in international affairs.

In a period when we have witnessed the forced integration of peoples into a totalitarian political system in another part of the world, it is a significant fact, as members of this committee are well aware, that statehood for Hawaii, as for Alaska, would be in accordance with the freely expressed aspirations of the peoples of these Territories.

If the Congress passes this legislation and Hawaii is admitted as a State, I would be particularly proud, sir, to be able to inform the United Nations that we had fulfilled that obligation.

Now, sir, I should like to refer with just a word to some statements of Secretary Chapman and the Governor about the particular significance of statehood for Hawaii because of the nature of the mixed population there.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you proceed to that, may I pursue this obligation to which you referred?

Mr. HICKERSON. Yes, indeed, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you conceive that obligation to be one which extends only to Hawaii?

Mr. HICKERSON. No, sir. It extends to all non-self-governing territories of all of the members of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN. How should we make a distinction from the point of view of the United Nations between Puerto Rico and Hawaii?

Mr. HICKERSON. That is very easy to do, sir, because the people of Puerto Rico have expressed themselves as not wishing statehood at this time.

There is no particular time limit on this obligation, sir. It is to accord with the wishes of the people as they progressively express themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the rule, as you see it, by which Congress should be guided in determining the qualifications for statehood of areas which may come within its Territorial jurisdiction?

Mr. HICKERSON. That, sir, I think is a matter for the determination of Congress in the exercise of its constitutional powers, taking into account the freely expressed views of the inhabitants of the particular Territory.

I repeat, sir, there is no especial or particular time limit in this obligation. It is merely a general obligation to assist the people in their progress toward full self-government.

The CHAIRMAN. I take it that the obligation is limited, so far as statehood is concerned, to the inhabitants of Territories which are within the jurisdiction of the United States at the present time or which might be brought within that jurisdiction by any national policy in the future.

Mr. HICKERSON. That is correct, sir. Statehood, of course, is not the only way that obligation can be met.

As regards Puerto Rico, if the people of Puerto Rico want a constitution and want something short of statehood, in our view we could fulfill this obligation fully by taking that action, which would not be statehood.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any obligation that flows from the United Nations Charter upon the United States with respect to the other islands of the Pacific, which is different from the obligation that you have referred to with respect to Hawaii?

Mr. HICKERSON. Yes, sir; there is a different obligation because of a different situation. The former Japanese mandated islands are administered by the United States, not as United States territories, but administered as a strategic trusteeship under the provisions of an agreement between the United States and the Security Council. It would not, of course, be proper to even consider statehood for those islands, even if they were ready, because they are not United States Territories. They are administered as trust territories. Guam is a United States territory. We have an obligation to promote progressive self-government in Guam, as we have in other United States Territories.

As regards the other islands in the Pacific, United States territories, they are quite small, and the circumstances are completely different from Hawaii.

The CHAIRMAN. Do we then or do we not by the action with respect to Hawaii on this question set a precedent for future action with respect to other areas that lie within either ocean noncontiguous to the United States?

Mr. HICKERSON. No, sir. We do not set any particular precedent for that because the Congress is the judge of the circumstances as regards any particular islands.

There is nothing, of course, in the Pacific comparable to the Hawaiian situation, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We have this very difficult problem, I will say, arising from the fact that there seems to be, so far as the testimony

given in either of these hearings as yet, no particular rule for the determination of statehood, either by geographical boundary or by population.

In Puerto Rico we have an island with a perfectly huge population, a population which is far beyond the capacity of the resources of that island to support in any degree of prosperity; in Guam we have a population which likewise is undoubtedly very much limited by natural resources; in Alaska we have a small population and a perfectly huge area; with respect to Hawaii, on the other hand, we have a small area and a rather large population, we have excellent natural resources and agricultural possibilities, which have resulted in most remarkable economic development and prosperity. At the same time, we have there a problem of unemployment and also a problem of, I think one might say, the proletariat, because there is a large segment of that population which is wholly dependent upon resources outside of itself for employment. I think that is the real heart of the Communist development which has been noted by many people there.

MR. HICKERSON. Mr. Chairman, the Constitution, of course, puts the responsibility on Congress to determine what territories should be admitted as States and to be the judge of when the time has arrived to admit them.

There is nothing in our obligation under the Charter of the United Nations that adds to or subtracts from the constitutional power and responsibilities of the Congress to determine this question.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Would Mr. Hickerson permit me to inject a remark?

MR. HICKERSON. Of course.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Would I be impertinent in offering something on this question, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN. May I first read into the record at this point the quotation, article 73 of chapter 12 of the Charter of the United Nations, which is the provision of the Charter that directs the administering power of any non-self-governing territory with respect to its duty. The duty is to—

develop the self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions according to the particular circumstances in each territory and its people and their varying stages of advancement.

Now, the reason that I brought that up was to obtain the statement of the Secretary of State, which I understand has already been made, namely, that this language does not carry by any interpretation any obligation to control the action of Congress with respect to statehood for any particular non-self-governing area, but merely that it shall develop self-government in all the circumstances that exist.

MR. HICKERSON. That is correct, sir. There is no special obligation other than what you just read, sir, there is no time limit on that, but if Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional powers, grants statehood, we regard that as complete fulfillment of this obligation.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary?

Secretary CHAPMAN. I wanted to make this comment: That the Congress of the United States itself decides the basis upon which it would permit a Territory to ask for statehood.

Under the Northwest ordinance, which was enacted by Congress and under the Supreme Court decisions of 1901, in the so-called In-

sular cases, it was decided that those incorporated areas, of which Alaska and Hawaii happen to be the only two remaining, are in a different class from the unincorporated territories of Puerto Rico, Guam, and Samoa. And as Mr. Hickerson said, the trust territory of the Pacific is in still a different category.

First, you have not extended the Constitution of the United States. We have pending before the Congress today an organic act for Guam in order that we may organize a self-governing body for Guam.

That has not yet been enacted. The bill would not extend the Constitution. There is a distinction and quite a difference between all of these other islands of the Pacific and Hawaii, a difference in the way the Government has treated it in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your definition according to the decision of incorporation as you have used that word?

Secretary CHAPMAN. That incorporation was used by the Supreme Court to mean the extension of the Constitution to its fullest extent short of statehood.

The CHAIRMAN. Your answer is that the act of Congress creating the Northwest Territory provided for the incorporation of that Territory into the Union in a particular way, which has not been followed with respect to Puerto Rico or Guam?

Secretary CHAPMAN. That is right, because later Congress passed another act incorporating Hawaii and Alaska after that date. The pattern of the Northwest ordinance was followed.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be helpful to the committee, Mr. Secretary, if the Interior Department and the Department of State would prepare a legal memorandum for inclusion in the record on this question of incorporation.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I will be very happy to prepare that.

Senator ANDERSON. It seems to be important if that same principle would apply to the incorporation of Guam.

The CHAIRMAN. That is precisely why I am asking.

Secretary CHAPMAN. There is no attempt to include Guam. The proposed organic act does not make provision for the extension of the Constitution to Guam. We are not even asking for it in that case.

Senator BUTLER. They may ask for it sometime.

Secretary CHAPMAN. They may, but first you must decide that it shall be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. As you have pointed out, Mr. Secretary, Alaska and Hawaii are incorporated Territories.

Secretary CHAPMAN. They are.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there no others?

Secretary CHAPMAN. There are no others.

The CHAIRMAN. It is most important in the consideration of these two acts and the other legislation before this committee that the Congress shall have this distinction between incorporated and nonincorporated territory clearly in mind and that there shall also be a distinction made clear to all the members of the United Nations between the obligation to develop self-government among peoples and the obligation to admit peoples to the status of a State of the Federal Union.

Secretary CHAPMAN. There is quite a distinction and quite a difference.

The CHAIRMAN. That is why I would like to have a carefully prepared legal memorandum on this point.

Secretary CHAPMAN. We will have that prepared, Senator, in consultation with the Secretary of State's office.

(The legal memorandum was subsequently supplied and is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
DIVISION OF TERRITORIES AND ISLAND POSSESSIONS,
Washington, May 10, 1950.

MEMORANDUM

To: The Secretary.

From: Chief Counsel.

Subject: United States Obligation To Grant Statehood to Alaska and Hawaii.

In accordance with your request, there follows a discussion of the United States obligation to admit Alaska and Hawaii to the Union. The views incorporated in this memorandum have been submitted to the House Public Lands Committee at the time of its hearings on the two statehood bills; for the House committee, like the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, expressed an interest in the question. This memorandum has been cleared informally with Assistant Secretary of State Hickerson. The portion relating to our obligations under the United Nations Charter was prepared in the Department of State.

I. Obligation assumed by the United States under chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations in relation to statehood for Alaska and Hawaii

The question has been raised whether the admission of Alaska and Hawaii to the Union would, having regard to the provisions of chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations, constitute a precedent requiring similar action in respect to other United States territories and possessions.

Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations is a "Declaration Regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories." Under that chapter the United States, as a Government responsible for the administration of certain non-self-governing territories, accepted the obligation, among others, "to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement." As will be apparent from this language, this constitutes an obligation to develop self-government in the Territories and possessions of the United States, but as will be equally apparent, it is not a commitment to develop such self-government in a specific manner or toward a specific goal, such as statehood. The Charter of the United Nations, in its provisions relating to non-self-governing territories, neither diminishes nor increases the powers of Congress to determine the constitutional status of United States Territories and possessions. Accordingly, the granting of statehood to Alaska and Hawaii would not obligate the United States to give a similar status to its remaining Territories or possessions in order to fulfill its obligations under the United Nations Charter but would leave this Government in future full freedom to deal with other situations or cases in accordance with the particular circumstances of each Territory.

II. Obligations assumed under domestic law

Although the United States has assumed no international obligation to grant statehood to Alaska and Hawaii or to any of the other non-self-governing areas under its administration, it has by implication promised the two Territories of Alaska and Hawaii that when they had shown that they were qualified to exercise the prerogatives and discharge the responsibilities of statehood, they would be advanced to that status on an equal footing with the other 48 States. The implied promise referred to arises from the action of the Congress in "incorporating" both Territories by the express extension to them of the Constitution and from the implications of incorporation.

The distinction between incorporated and unincorporated territories was first clearly drawn by the Supreme Court of the United States in the so-called Insular cases, *De Lima v. Bidwell* (182 U. S. 1) and *Downes v. Bidwell* (182 U. S. 244), in 1901, although the first incorporated Territory was created in 1787. The question before the Court was whether the constitutional requirement that duties, imposts, and excises be uniform "throughout the United States" had been extended to Puerto Rico so as to render invalid a provision of Puerto Rico's organic act establishing a schedule of customs duties on merchandise from Puerto

Rico entering the continental United States. The Court decided that Puerto Rico was not a part of the United States for the purposes of the constitutional provision, because it had not been "incorporated." Subsequent decisions pointed out that "incorporation occurs when a territory is made a part of the United States, as distinguished from merely belonging to it," and that "incorporation is not to be assumed without express declaration, or an implication so strong as to exclude any other view" (*Balzac v. People of Porto Rico* (258 U. S. 298 (1922))).

It is settled that incorporation of a territory takes place when the Constitution is expressly extended to it. Section 5 of the Organic Act of Hawaii (act of April 30, 1900, 31 Stat. 141, 48 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 495) provides: "The Constitution * * * shall have the same force and effect within the Territory of Hawaii as elsewhere in the United States," and identical language with respect to the application of the Constitution to Alaska is contained in section 3 of the Organic Act of Alaska (act of August 24, 1912, 37 Stat. 512, 48 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 23). The incorporated status of both Alaska and Hawaii has been given judicial recognition (*Nagle v. United States* (191 Fed. 141 (1911)); *Rasmussen v. United States* (197 U. S. 516 (1905)); *United States v. Farwell* (76 F. Supp. 35 (1948)); cf. *Hawaii v. Mankichi* (190 U. S. 197 (1903))).

There are at least three reasons for the emphasis on clear evidence of intent to incorporate. One is that by incorporating a Territory the Congress subjects itself to certain limitations upon its power subsequently to legislate for that Territory which do not apply when it legislates for an unincorporated area. This was established by the *Insular Cases*. For example, the Congress could not withdraw from the people of an incorporated Territory the right to a jury trial guaranteed by the Constitution, *Rasmussen v. United States* (197 U. S. 529 (1905)), but need not grant the right to the people of an unincorporated Territory, *Balzoc v. People of Porto Rico*, supra; *Dorr v. United States* (195 U. S. 138 (1904)) (Philippine Islands). The second reason is that it is generally agreed that the act of incorporation is irrevocable, since the Constitution, once extended, cannot be withdrawn. See the concurring opinions in *Rasmussen v. United States*, supra (pp. 530, 536); Cooley's *Principles of Constitutional Law* (4th ed., 1931, p. 214). The third, and most important here, is that the act of incorporation has consistently been regarded as a commitment by the Congress ultimately to admit as a State the area incorporated. In the *Blazac case*, supra, the Supreme Court said that "incorporation has always been a step, and an important one, leading to statehood." In *McAllister v. United States* (141 U. S. 174, 188 (1891)), Territorial government was described as temporary and destined to be "super-seded when the Territories became States of the Union." In *Ex Parte Morgan* (20 F. 298, 305 (1883)), a Territory is described as "an inchoate State." In *O'Donoghue v. United States* (289 U. S. 516, 537 (1933)), the Court said that "the outlying continental public domain, of which the United States was the proprietor, was, from the beginning, destined for admission as a State or States into the Union." Constitutional law treatises contain similar statements. There are repeated references to the fact that the ultimate political status of Territories is statehood in the congressional debates on the organic acts. To cite an example in the case of Alaska, Congressman Wedemeyer, of Michigan, declared that by the treaty with Russia itself, "Alaska was incorporated into the body of the United States and * * * those people had the promise of future statehood for the Territory." In an effort to avoid the well-understood consequence of incorporation, namely statehood, when the Hawaiian Organic Act was being debated, Congressman Hill offered the following amendment: "Nothing in this act shall be construed, taken, or held to imply a pledge or promise that the Territory of Hawaii will at any future time be admitted as a State or attached to any State." (33 Cong. Rec. 3864.) The amendment was defeated. The Congressional Record is replete with other evidence that Members of Congress were aware of the significance of proposed incorporation and considered it to be a first step in the direction of statehood.

The strongest possible argument that incorporation is a step toward statehood is historical precedent. All incorporated Territories except Alaska and Hawaii have become States. The first of a series of organic acts for incorporated territories was the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. Besides providing the framework of government for the Northwest Territory, which was erected upon lands ceded to the Federal Government by the Thirteen Original States, the ordinance outlined a policy with respect to ultimate status for the Territory which was followed for Territories subsequently acquired. It provided that when the population in any of the districts into which the Territory was divided should reach 60,000, the district was to be admitted into the Union as a State on an

equal footing with the original States. Organic legislation subsequently enacted for the Southwest Territory, Indian Territory, the Territory of Michigan, the Territory of Illinois and the Territory of Orleans, among others, "incorporated" the territory to which they applied and made provision for ultimate statehood. One by one, all the incorporated territories on the mainland have been admitted, as one or more States, to the Union. The constitutional status of Alaska and Hawaii is identical to those of the mainland territories, and there is no legal basis for treating them in any different way. Although the organic acts of Alaska and Hawaii do not refer in explicit terms to statehood, the fact that they extend the Constitution and thereby incorporate the areas into the Union is sufficient. Once an area has been incorporated into the Union, the only question which remains for determination is when it is to be advanced from the provisional status of a Territory to the permanent status of a State; the question whether it is to be admitted into the Union as a State is settled upon incorporation. It is for the Territory to make out a case that, at a particular time, it is qualified for statehood in terms of population, financial condition, and so on. These conditions go only to the time at which the pledge of ultimate statehood is to be redeemed. Until the incorporated Territory is admitted to statehood, its status as such a Territory must continue, assuming it to be sound constitutional doctrine, as I believe it is, that once the constitution is extended, it cannot be withdrawn. Thus Alaska and Hawaii differ in this respect from the unincorporated Territories. The Philippines were an unincorporated Territory, and consequently it was constitutionally possible to grant them their independence; had they been previously incorporated by extension of the Constitution, a serious constitutional question as to the propriety of independence would have arisen.

It is relevant to emphasize that admission of Alaska and Hawaii as States would not give the other areas presently subject to the administration of the United States a like claim to statehood as a matter of domestic law any more than it would provide a basis for a claim under the United Nations Charter. This is because Alaska and Hawaii are our only remaining incorporated Territories. Their admission would fulfill a long outstanding pledge and would complete a cycle originating with the Northwest Territory; it would not itself establish a precedent. Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are unincorporated territories. Puerto Rico's political status has been so described in the *Insular cases* and in the *Balzac case* cited above; the Virgin Islands are described in the Organic Act (49 Stat. 1807, 48 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 1405a), as an "insular possession," which is shorthand for "unincorporated territory." Guam and American Samoa, by section 3 of the proposed organic acts pending before the Congress, are expressly declared to be "unincorporated" territories, specifically to preclude any claim on the part of either area to statehood as a right. No one of these areas can now identify its status wholly with that of Alaska or Hawaii for the purpose of bottoming a statehood claim. Should some future Congress determine it to be desirable to incorporate any one of these presently unincorporated territories, it may, of course, do so. If it does, however, that action will thereby give the area a claim to ultimate statehood which it does not now possess and which it cannot legally or morally derive from the action of Congress in admitting Alaska and Hawaii to statehood now. Each area must stand on its own merits in acquiring an incorporated status. When that hurdle is passed, then and then only has it a claim to statehood.

In summary, the admission of Alaska and Hawaii to the Union will not commit the United States to the admission of any other area under its administration in order to comply with its obligations under the United Nations Charter, nor will it provide a precedent for like treatment of the other territorial areas as a matter of domestic law. The nature of the status of Alaska and Hawaii as incorporated Territories affords them a claim to statehood on the basis of historical precedent in our treatment of every other incorporated territory, and at the same time distinguishes their case from that of every other territorial area presently under United States administration. The only question actually before Congress for determination is whether, as a matter of fact, Alaska and Hawaii are qualified for admission. Their eligibility as a matter of law was expressly recognized and established in 1912 and 1900, respectively, when they were incorporated into the Union.

IRWIN W. SILVERMAN, *Chief Counsel.*

Mr. HICKERSON. Mr. Chairman, I was going to comment very briefly on the special significance attaching internationally to the admission of Hawaii in view of the mixed population.

Secretary Chapman referred to that, and so did the Governor.

I think if I might quote four sentences from a recent report from a House Subcommittee on Public Lands, I would like to read those, sir. This was dated January 1950:

The prompt admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State will be notice to the people of the Pacific and to the world that this country intends in no sense to retreat from its position of leadership in the Pacific, won at a great cost in World War II, and on the contrary proposes that every legitimate step be taken to preserve and strengthen the objectives achieved in that struggle.

It will be reassuring to the friends of democracy. The United States will give them a practical demonstration of its belief in the democratic system of government by admitting Hawaii to the Union as a State and its people, thereby, to the full privileges of American citizenship. This example will be of far-reaching influence in Japan, the Philippines, Korea, and China, from whence many of Hawaii's people, now American citizens of long residence in the islands, originally migrated.

It will provide an effective answer to Communist propaganda that is undertaking to persuade the people of the Pacific, and particularly the Far East, that there are racial barriers in the American system of government that militate against people of oriental origin.

This describes my own feeling in it so well, sir, that I took the liberty of quoting from this subcommittee of the House. I have nothing further, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I take it from that, Mr. Secretary, that it is your opinion and the opinion of the Department of State that the admission of Hawaii as a State would be and is an important part of the program of the United States in its world policy for the development of free institutions throughout the world; is that right?

Mr. HICKERSON. That is correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions to be directed to the Secretary?

Senator TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I have one question.

Mr. Hickerson, on page 7 of this bill on line 20, beginning on line 20, there appears this wording:

The constitution—

the Hawaiian Constitution—

shall be republican in form and make no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race, color, or sex and not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

We are aware that just recently a California court ruled that a law out there prohibiting the acquisition of property by orientals was declared void because it was in conflict with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

I was wondering if it would be appropriate to include in this paragraph reference to the Charter of the United Nations. Do you think that would be necessary?

Mr. HICKERSON. I do not think that is necessary, sir. I think that Hawaii should be admitted to the United States on the same footing as the other States in the United States.

The obligations of the Charter would apply to her, of course, as they do to other States, but I do not think the Charter should be mentioned specifically in this legislation.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Otherwise, I think Mr. Hickerson agrees the same as I do that the United States Government should determine on its own how it will permit an area to become a State and a member of the Union.

Senator TAYLOR. I simply thought, inasmuch as the courts were taking cognizance and make rulings based on the United Nations Charter, it might be advisable to include a reference to it in the bill.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I am quite certain, if you will check that court decision, that you will find it was based upon a ruling of the Supreme Court in regard to the Constitution of the United States, and not the United Nations Charter.

Senator TAYLOR. There was reference made to the United Nations Charter.

Secretary CHAPMAN. They may have made reference to it, but the decision was based upon the Constitution of the United States.

Senator Knowland, am I correct in that, or are you familiar with it?

Senator KNOWLAND. I saw the newspaper reports, but not the court decision, and they seemed to emphasize the United Nations Charter end of it; but without reading the whole decision, it would be difficult to tell.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I read the decision, and I interpreted it to mean that the decision was based on the Constitution of the United States, that the basic law passed in California saying that certain citizens could not own property was contrary to the Constitution of the United States.

They made further reference to the United Nations Charter as trying to extend—I think they used that to show that the Constitution was fully intended to carry out that purpose. I do not think they placed their technical decision upon that fact alone.

Mr. Chairman, may I make one more correction if Mr. Hickerson does not mind, just a correction that has no reference to him, but it has to do with the previous witness, Governor Stainback.

It has been mentioned to me in a very quiet way that I might be influencing Governor Stainback to come here to testify.

Let me say to this committee publicly and to Governor Stainback that I have not instructed Governor Stainback, either directly or indirectly, regarding these hearings to appear here one way or the other, and I did not know until Saturday that he was coming, and if he came, he came on his own volition, without any words, directly or indirectly, from my office.

The fact that the Governor of Hawaii is recommended for appointment by the Secretary of the Interior, appointed by the President, and confirmed by the Senate, had nothing to do with his appearance here.

I say that for the record because I want that on top of the table. I want no whisperings on any side, whether in regard to lands or rights, I want them all above-board.

The CHAIRMAN. We will now hear from Senator Knowland.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman and members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Hawaii's claim to statehood is so overwhelming that it cannot in justice be longer delayed.

One hundred and two years ago the State I have the honor to represent came under the American flag. Two years later California was

admitted into the Union without going through the apprenticeship of Territorial government. For a century we have been the closest neighbor to Hawaii and have some claim to knowing her best. It is with great pleasure that I appear today to plead her cause without any reservation whatsoever.

Hawaii has been an organized Territory for a longer period than any of the organized Territories ultimately admitted to statehood with the single exception of New Mexico. With the lone exception of Oklahoma, it has more population than any of the others had at the time of their admission into the Union. Today it has more population than six of our States and is within close proximity to the totals residing in four more. In fiscal year 1947 Hawaii contributed in Federal taxes more than 12 of our States.

By official vote of her people, she has requested admission into the Union. Certainly, no individual poll of a few hundred people, a part of whom remain anonymous, can outweigh the recorded vote of the people.

I am firmly convinced that Communist activity is a no greater problem than it is in many other areas of our country. Because Hawaii happens to have some of these termites is no valid argument for delaying her admission as a State. To the contrary, statehood will better fortify her people in dealing with a problem which is not just Nation-wide but is world-wide in character.

The record of loyalty in peace and war by the people of the Territory of Hawaii cannot be challenged.

Both the Democratic and Republican platforms have pledged their support to statehood on several occasions.

For the reasons I have outlined and which will be covered more fully by other witness, I believe that Hawaii should become a State now, without further delay.

However, there is another reason which should not be overlooked by the Congress or the American people.

The free way of life is under pressure from the Elbe to the China Sea. Six hundred million people are behind the Communist iron curtain as we meet here on this 1st day of May 1950. In the Far East several hundred million more hang in the balance. International communism is on the march and this may be the year of decision that will determine whether or not it will move on to new destruction or will recede in the face of the determination to maintain their way of life by a free world of freemen.

The people of Hawaii have much to offer in helping to interpret the spirit of America to the Far East, containing more than half of the world's population. They can do equally as much in helping the United States understand the complex problems of that vast area of the world. Never before was it more important to the peace of the world and the very security of this Nation that such mutual understanding be achieved.

We dare not remain static while communism becomes the dynamic force in the world. To the contrary, from the Arctic to the mid-Pacific we should resolutely and effectively proclaim to the world that these American citizens in our two organized Territories are no longer to be stateless persons.

Now is the time for us to clearly point out that the people in both these great Pacific Territories, which are vital to the defense of the

Pacific flank of the continental United States, are not just wards in a distant orphanage, but are integral parts of the American family of States. We will no more tolerate an incursion against either Hawaii or Alaska than we would against any other part of our Union.

Nineteen hundred and fifty is a year of decision for us, also. Let us not fiddle and faddle on the issue statehood. If we fumble the ball now and let the play be taken away from us by those who detest the free way of life future generations may wonder what happened to the youth and vigor that made America great.

This year may well become one of the great turning points of history. We must not be complacent and self-satisfied for therein will be found the seeds of decay.

In life there is no such thing as a status quo. Individuals and governments either grow or they go into a decline and others rise to take their places. As a nation, our country is still young. New horizons are still ahead of us.

In your hands, gentlemen of the committee, rests a fateful decision. You can do much to serve notice on the world that America still retains the spirit and vigor of the pioneer. By your action you can help demonstrate that we have the vision and the faith to know that our new forty-ninth and fiftieth States are but at the threshold of a great development whose horizons are limited only by what a free and enterprising people can achieve when admitted to a full partnership under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this committee will promptly approve statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Knowland.

There shall be made a part of the record at this point a proposed amendment to H. R. 49, suggested by the chairman of the Chief Justice's Judicial Conference Committee and transmitted by the Honorable Albert B. Maris, United States circuit judge, United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, 2070 United States Courthouse, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

(The proposed amendment is as follows:)

[Committee print]

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H. R. 49—HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

By direction of the chairman, the enclosed communication is printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The covering letter explains that the suggestions are made by the chairman of the Chief Justice's Judicial Conference Committee and are transmitted by the Honorable Albert B. Maris, United States circuit judge, United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, 2070 United States Courthouse, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

UNITED STATES COURT OF
APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT,
Philadelphia, Pa., March 28, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,

*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: As chairman of the Judicial Conference Committee appointed by the Chief Justice to collaborate with Congress in the recent revision of title 28 of the United States Code, I have examined H. R. 49, the bill to provide statehood for Hawaii, which passed the House of Representatives on March 7.

I find that the bill which was originally drawn prior to the revision of title 28 should be amended in a number of respects so as to conform with the present

provisions of that title. I have accordingly prepared amendments to accomplish this, two copies of which I enclose, together with two copies of a memorandum which I think fully explains the suggested amendments and the reasons for them. I am taking the liberty of submitting these to you at this time in order that they may be before your committee when it comes to consider the bill.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT B. MARIS.

MEMORANDUM RE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 49 (HAWAII STATEHOOD BILL)

Sections 9, 10, and 11 of the bill provide that the State of Hawaii shall constitute a judicial district in the ninth circuit, that to the United States District Court thereby created two judges shall be appointed, that the court shall hold regular terms at Honolulu, that the District of Hawaii shall include the outlying Pacific islands named in title 28 in addition to the State of Hawaii, and that a clerk, United States attorney, United States marshal, and such other personnel as is provided for by the laws relating to district courts, judges, and judicial districts shall be appointed. The provisions of these sections were originally drafted prior to the effective date of revised title 28, United States Code, which was enacted into substantive law on June 25, 1948, effective September 1, 1948. Under the provisions of title 28 Hawaii is now a regularly constituted Federal judicial district which includes, in addition to the Territory of Hawaii, the islands above referred to (see sec. 91 of title 28) and the former District Court for the Territory of Hawaii has now become the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii upon an equal basis so far as constitutionally possible with all the other United States district courts (see secs. 132, 133, 134, and 451 of revised title 28).

In other words, under the revision of title 28, Hawaii and Puerto Rico were made Federal judicial districts upon an equality with the Federal judicial districts in the 48 States and the District of Columbia and the existing district courts in Hawaii and Puerto Rico, created by the respective organic acts, were transferred from those acts to title 28 and integrated as fully as possible into the Federal judiciary. Since, however, the judges of those two courts were not given life tenure it is clear that the two courts do not and cannot exercise judicial power under the judiciary article of the Constitution, article III, section 1, since that article requires judges exercising power under it to be appointed for good behavior. It, therefore, follows that the United States district courts in Hawaii and Puerto Rico must still derive their judicial power as legislative courts created by Congress pursuant to the power to regulate the Territories given by article IV, section 3.

Accordingly it seems clear that all that will be necessary to convert the present United States District Court for the District of Hawaii into a true United States district court upon the admission of Hawaii into the Union will be to provide that the judges shall hold office during good behavior and that the cost shall thenceforth derive its judicial power from article III, section 1. Indeed both these steps are essential if the present United States District Court for the district court if H. R. 49 should be passed with sections 9, 10, and 11 in their will obviously no longer have power to continue the court as a legislative court created under the power to regulate the Territories. Under these circumstances it will lead to a great deal of confusion, ambiguity, and doubt as to the present district court if H. R. 49 should be passed with sections 9, 10, and 11 in their present form. Amendments have accordingly been prepared to these sections as well as to sections 12, 13, and 14 and they will now be discussed.

I

This amendment proposes to strike out all of section 9 of the bill and insert in lieu thereof a new section of three paragraphs effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

Paragraph (a) provides that the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii now established by and existing under title 28, United States Code, shall thenceforth be a court of the United States with judicial power derived from article III, section 1, of the Constitution, that the terms of office of the present district judges shall terminate and that the President, pursuant to section 134 of title 28, as amended by paragraph (c) of this proposed amendment to section 10 of the bill, shall appoint two district judges for the district of Hawaii to hold office during good behavior.

Paragraph (b) amends section 133 of title 28 so as to eliminate the present provision that 3 years prior residence in Hawaii is requisite to appointment as district judge. This proviso is obviously unnecessary after statehood, when the State of Hawaii will have two Senators in the confirming body, and it is eliminated by section 9 of the present bill.

Paragraph (c) amends section 134 of title 28 so as to provide that the district judges in Hawaii shall hold office during good behavior instead of for the term of 6 years as at present.

II

This amendment proposed to strike out all of section 10 of the bill which is wholly unnecessary since its provisions are already fully covered by section 91 of title 28 and to insert in lieu thereof a new section of two paragraphs effective upon admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

Paragraph (a) proposes to amend section 333 of title 28 relating to the Judicial Conferences of the various circuits so as to authorize the district judges in Hawaii to attend the conference for the ninth circuit in the same way as the district judges for the other States of the circuit.

Paragraph (b) proposes to amend section 451 of title 28, the definition section of the title, so as to eliminate the District Court for the District of Hawaii as an exceptional type of district court since it will then be a district court **exactly** on all fours with every other district court in every other State.

III

This amendment proposes to strike out section 11 of the bill and insert in lieu thereof a new section of four paragraphs effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

Paragraphs (a) and (d) repeal the provisions of sections 501 and 541 of title 28 that 3 years' residence is requisite to appointment as United States attorney and United States marshal respectively for the district of Hawaii, those provisions not being appropriate upon statehood, having been dropped in section 11 of the bill.

Paragraphs (b) and (c) eliminate the provisions of sections 504 and 541, title 28, which provide that the term of office of the United States attorney and United States marshal for the district of Hawaii shall be 6 years, thereby making their terms 4 years, in order to conform to the term of office of all other United States attorneys and United States marshals in all the other districts. This discrepancy in length of term is likewise eliminated in section 11 of the bill.

IV

Sections 12 and 13 of the bill require some modification insofar as they refer to the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii, which is the old name of the court, while it was still under the organic act prior to September 1, 1948, but which under title 28 has now been changed to United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, and insofar as they provide for the transfer of proceedings from the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii to the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii. If, as proposed by the amendment to section 9, the present United States District Court for the District of Hawaii is to be continued in existence after statehood no such transfer will be necessary. This amendment accordingly proposes to amend section 12 by correcting the name of the present United States District Court in Hawaii and by eliminating the provisions for the transfer of proceedings from the present court to a new United States District Court for the District of Hawaii.

V

This amendment proposes to make similar changes in section 13 as those proposed to be made to section 12 and above described.

VI

This amendment proposes to make certain necessary changes in section 14. That section as passed by the House makes amendments to various sections of titles 28 and 48. It is proposed to amend paragraph (a) of section 14 so as to cast it into the form of a direct amendment of section 1252 of title 28 which would strike out the word "Hawaii" from the section.

The amendment also proposes to modify paragraphs (d) and (e) of section 14 and to add a new paragraph (f). Paragraph (d) presently provides that section 373 of title 28 "insofar as it relates to any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, shall be null and void." Section 373 is the provision for retirement of judges in the Territories and possessions. It now applies to the judges of the United States District Courts for the Districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, and the District Court of the Virgin Islands and the justices of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii. It is believed that the intent of the present subsection is to eliminate the justices of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii from the coverage of the section after statehood. Obviously both they and the judges of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii should be eliminated from the section upon statehood, the judges of the Supreme Court of the Territory because that court will then cease to be a Territorial court and the judges of the United States district court because they will then be entitled to retirement under sections 371 and 372 as United States judges appointed to hold office during good behavior. However, it is not believed that it is intended to repeal the provisions of section 373 with respect to justices of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii who may have actually retired under the section prior to statehood. The proposed substitute for paragraph (d) of section 14 accordingly provides for the amendment of section 373 of title 28 by eliminating from its provisions the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii and the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii with the proviso that the amendment shall not affect the rights of any judge or justice who may have retired before statehood.

The proposed amendment by a second proviso also takes care of the situation in which United States District Judge Metzger finds himself. Judge Metzger served over 5 years on the Territorial circuit court and on August 5, 1949, completed 10 years' service on the district court. If he were a United States district judge holding office under article III he would have been eligible to retire on that date with full pay since he was then 74 years of age. However, under section 373, the Territorial judicial retirement provision, service of 16 years on the district court or Supreme Court of Hawaii is required for retirement at full pay. Accordingly if upon statehood Judge Metzger should not be reappointed to one of the life judgeships he would not be eligible to retire on full pay although all the judges of the other United States district courts would be so entitled under like circumstances.

The second proviso to the proposed amendment to section 373 accordingly provides that service upon the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii and on the district court for the Territory shall be included in computing length of judicial service for the purposes of retirement under either the Federal Judicial Retirement Act (secs. 371 and 372, title 28) or the Territorial Retirement Act (sec. 373, title 28), in the case of the two district judges now in commission in Hawaii, Judges Metzger and McLaughlin. Since Judge McLaughlin is a comparatively young man the proposed amendment would in fact only apply to Judge Metzger. It would, however, permit him to retire on full pay under the Territorial Judicial Retirement Act on or after June 18, 1950, if the bill is passed and Hawaii becomes a State. Likewise, if he should be reappointed upon statehood it would permit him to retire on full pay at any time thereafter under the Federal Judicial Retirement Act. In view of Judge Metzger's long and distinguished service and the rather anomalous situation in which he would otherwise find himself on the transfer from territorial status to statehood the provision suggested would appear to be fair and just.

The present paragraph (e) of section 14 provides that "title 48, section 634 (a) shall be null and void."

Section 634a of title 48 contains the provisions relating to Hawaii of the act of May 29, 1928 (ch. 904, 45 Stat. 997). Since title 48 has not yet been enacted into positive law it is clear that the bill should deal directly with the act of 1928. That act fixed the salaries of judges in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Philippine Islands, and the United States Court for China. So far as it relates to the judges of Puerto Rico its provisions are completely supplied by the acts of June 24, 1948, chapter 610, section 2, 62 Statute 579 and September 7, 1949, chapter 544, 63 Statute 692 (48 U. S. C. 797). Insofar as its provisions relate to the judge of the District Court of the Virgin Islands they are superseded and supplied by the act of May 24, 1940, chapter 209, section 3, 54 Statute 220, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 1392a). Insofar as the provisions of the act of

1928 relate to the judges of the Philippine Islands they are obsolete by virtue of the operation of the Independence Act and insofar as they relate to the judge of the United States Court for China they are obsolete in view of the abolition of that court by treaty. Accordingly it will be appropriate, effective upon Hawaii attaining statehood, for the entire act of May 29, 1928, to be repealed. Likewise section 92 of the organic act should be repealed, this being the section which provides that the salaries of the Governor of the Territory, the secretary of the Territory, and the Territorial judges shall be paid by the United States. The proposed amendment to section 14 (e) accordingly repeals both acts.

Finally, the amendment proposes to add a new paragraph (f) to section 14 to repeal section 86 of the organic act as amended. As amended by the act of June 25, 1948, chapter 646, section 8, 62 Statute 986, it provides that the laws of the United States relating to the removal of cases, appeals, etc., as between the courts of the United States and the courts of the several States shall govern in such matters as between the courts of the United States and the courts of the Territory of Hawaii. This provision obviously becomes unnecessary when Hawaii becomes a State.

ALBERT B. MARIS.

MARCH 20, 1950.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 49 (HAWAII STATEHOOD BILL) AS PASSED BY HOUSE,
NEEDED TO COMPLY WITH REVISED TITLE 28, U. S. CODE

(Prepared by A. B. Maris, March 20, 1950)

I. Strike out all of section 9, from line 17, page 21, to line 2, page 22, both inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 9. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

"(a) The United States District Court for the District of Hawaii established by and existing under title 28 of the United States Code shall thenceforth be a court of the United States with judicial power derived from article III, section I, of the Constitution of the United States: *Provided, however,* That the terms of office of the district judges for the District of Hawaii then in office shall terminate upon the effective date of this section and the President, pursuant to sections 133 and 134 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this act, shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two district judges for the said district who shall hold office during good behavior;

"(b) The last paragraph of section 133 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed; and

"(c) Subsection (a) of section 134 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The district judges, except in Puerto Rico, shall hold office during good behavior. The district judge in Puerto Rico shall hold office for the term of 8 years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified."

II. Strike out all of section 10 from line 3 to line 5, both inclusive, page 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 10. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

"(a) The first paragraph of section 333 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the words 'and residing within the continental United States,' the word 'or in Hawaii'; and

"(b) The second paragraph of section 451 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words 'including the district courts of the United States for the districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico,' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'including the United States district court for the District of Puerto Rico.'"

III. Strike out all of section 11, from line 6 to line 11, both inclusive, page 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 11. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

"(a) The last paragraph of section 501 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed;

"(b) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 504 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the end thereof the words 'except in the district of Hawaii, where the term shall be six years';

"(c) The first sentence of subsection (c) of section 541 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the end thereof the words 'except in the district of Hawaii where the term shall be six years'; and

"(d) Subsection (d) of section 541 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed."

IV. Amend section 12 by (a) striking out in line 14, page 22, the word "Territory" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "District"; (b) striking out in lines 18 and 19, page 22, the words "in the District Court of the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "shall continue in the United States District Court"; (c) striking out in lines 24 and 25, page 22, the words "and the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii"; (d) striking out in lines 1 and 2, page 23, the words "and the United District Court for the Territory of Hawaii," (e) striking out in lines 8 and 9, page 23, the words "and the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, respectively," and (f) inserting in line 18, page 23, after the word "said" and before the word "courts" the word "State".

V. Amend section 13 by (a) striking out in line 3, page 24, the word "Territory" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "District"; (b) striking out in lines 12 and 13, page 24, the words "District Court of the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "United States District Court"; (c) striking out in line 16, page 24, the words "District Court of the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "United States District Court"; and (d) striking out in lines 17 and 18, page 24, the words "as successor to the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii".

VI. Amend section 14 by (a) striking out in line 6, page 25, the word "excluding" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "striking out", by placing the word "Hawaii" in the same line in quotation marks and by striking out in the same line the words "application of", and (b) by striking out all of paragraphs (d) and (e), lines 17 to 20, both inclusive, page 25, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) The first paragraph of section 373 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words 'United States District Courts for the districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico,' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'United States District Court for the district of Puerto Rico,' and by striking out the words 'and any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii': *Provided*, That the amendments made by this subsection shall not affect the rights of any judge or justice who may have retired before the effective date of this subsection; *And provided further*, That service as a judge of the District Court for the Territory of Hawaii or as a judge of the United States Court for the District of Hawaii or as a justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii or as a judge of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii shall be included in computing under sections 371, 372, or 373 of title 28, United States Code, the aggregate years of judicial service of any person who is in commission as a district judge for the District of Hawaii on the date of enactment of this Act;

"(e) Section 92 of the Act of April 30, 1900 (chapter 339, 31 Stat. 159), as amended, and the Act of May 29, 1928 (chapter 904, 45 Stat. 997), are repealed; and

"(f) Section 86 of the Act approved April 30, 1900 (chapter 339, 31 Stat. 158), as amended, is repealed."

The CHAIRMAN. If it is satisfactory, we shall sit tomorrow morning and Delegate Farrington will at that time open the hearing.

That being the case, the committee will stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. We will meet in room 224.

(Whereupon, at 12:45 p. m., the committee recessed to reconvene at 10 a. m. Tuesday, May 2, 1950, in room 224, Senate Office Building.)



HAWAII STATEHOOD

TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1950

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:25 a. m., in room 224, Senate Office Building, Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators O'Mahoney, of Wyoming (chairman), Anderson (New Mexico), Taylor (Idaho), Lehman (New York), Butler (Nebraska), and Ecton (Montana).

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order, please. Delegate Farrington, are you prepared to proceed?

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, THE DELEGATE TO CONGRESS FROM HAWAII

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am Joseph R. Farrington, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

The CHAIRMAN. A position you have occupied since when?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Since 1942.

What I am to say now is in the nature of an introductory statement. I desire to outline briefly to the committee the plans we have developed for presenting our witnesses and testimony in support of the prompt enactment of H. R. 49.

H. R. 49 will enable Hawaii to become a State.

The bill as passed by the House will require certain amendments. These are necessary as the result of the passing of time and certain developments that are related to this legislation. They do not involve any changes in principle, but represent, rather, refinements and improvements in the legislation as passed by the House. With one minor exception, we do not anticipate any serious controversy on this aspect of the question before the committee.

The original bill calling for the election and holding of a constitutional convention was drafted on the basis of the election 1946. Shifts in population which took place subsequently made necessary some changes in the arrangement of voting precincts. The legislature of the Territory in enacting a law authorizing the holding of an election and a constitutional convention to draft a State constitution took account of these changes. We will ask that the provisions of the law passed by the legislature calling for an election already held and the convention now in progress be substituted for the provisions of the bill before your committee providing for this activity. We will ask that the election and the convention which is now sitting be given the full force of Federal law.

In other words, we want the results of the constitutional convention, which is now meeting in Honolulu, to count in the determination of this issue. That is the constitution under which we anticipate and hope we will become a State.

The question of the disposition of the public lands of the Territory is one to which a great deal of attention has been given. We are prepared to support the bill as passed by the House with some minor perfecting amendments. We strongly support the provisions under which those public lands whose final disposition is not determined in this legislation shall be made by joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives within a 5-year period.

The future of the Hawaiian Homes Commission project as provided for in the bill as passed by the House will be supported by the majority of the witnesses. Some opposition to this will be expressed by one of the witnesses who has come from Hawaii. We believe the overwhelming majority of our people, however, are in favor of allowing this provision of H. R. 49 to stand as it is.

I want to say that that witness is among those who is listed with those who accompanied the party from Hawaii. He is Senator Nobriga, of the island of Hawaii.

We have been fully informed of the amendments proposed by Judge Maris of Philadelphia to those provisions of the bill relating to the transfer of the judiciary from a Territorial to State status. These amendments are designed to bring these provisions of the bill up to date by making them conform with the amendments in the Judicial Code made in the Eightieth Congress. We are in favor of these amendments.

We believe that the amendments of the bill will be confined to the foregoing and that these, with the possible exception of the one I have already referred to, will not involve in any way the basic principles in our testimony and only questions of procedure and text that can very readily be resolved at the conclusion of the hearings.

Our testimony, therefore, will be designed principally to inform the committee fully of developments particularly of current interest that bear upon the consideration of this question.

H. R. 49 follows the pattern of most enabling acts. With some minor changes, the bill before you is identical with the measure passed by the House of Representatives in June of 1947 by a vote of 196 to 133.

The bill before you passed the House of Representatives on March 7 of this year by a vote of 262 to 110.

Those voting for the bill this year included an overwhelming majority of both Democratic and Republican Members of the House.

An analysis of the vote prepared by the Hawaii Statehood Commission shows the following:

In 37 State delegations, a majority voted for statehood for Hawaii.

Fourteen States voted unanimously for statehood for Hawaii.

Of the seven large States, only Texas, with 15 votes cast, recorded a majority against statehood.

The vote of the California representation showed 16 for statehood and 1 against, with 6 not voting.

In Illinois, 21 voted for statehood and 3 against, with 2 not voting.

Michigan, 12 for statehood and 4 against, with 1 not voting.

New York cast 27 votes for statehood and 8 against, with 10 not voting.

Ohio gave 16 votes for statehood, 5 against, and 2 not voting.

For Pennsylvania, 22 voted for statehood and 9 against, with 2 not voting.

I mention the large States particularly because it was argued extensively in the House that the large States were opposed to statehood on the grounds that it would dilute the representation in the United States Senate. It is evident the Members of the House did not feel that way.

The only State in which not a vote was cast for statehood for Hawaii was Virginia, and to offset this was the strong representation of votes for statehood from every other State in the South. The representation from the South was particularly gratifying.

We of Hawaii believe that nothing could demonstrate more clearly that the people of the United States are today overwhelmingly supporting us in our appeal for admission to the Union as a State.

The fact that the bill providing statehood for Hawaii passed the House in this Congress by a very much larger majority than it passed in the Eightieth Congress seems to us to be very impressive evidence that the support of this legislation continues steadily to become stronger and more widespread.

In the Eightieth Congress the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives reported the bill to the House by a unanimous vote, and in the Eighty-first Congress the same committee reported the bill with only one dissenting vote, and the member who cast the dissenting vote finally voted for the bill on its passage by the House.

As further evidence of the support of this legislation by the American people, I would like to present a list of the national organizations that have gone on record in favor of immediate statehood for Hawaii. This includes the conference of State governors to which Gov. Earl Warren referred in his testimony, as well as most of the leading patriotic, civic, and labor organizations of the country.

I would like to present for the record also a compilation of excerpts from recent editorial comments showing over 90 percent of the press of the country, including newspapers of every shade of political opinion and in all parts of the country, are in favor of admitting Hawaii to the Union as a State at this time.

I believe it is appropriate to incorporate in the record at this time excerpts from public statements by President Harry S. Truman, showing that between January 21, 1946, and January 4, 1950, he has on nine different occasions declared his support for immediate statehood for Hawaii.

I would like to present next a compilation of national party planks on statehood from 1900 to 1948, that is, the Republican and Democratic Parties, covering the position they have taken on this issue. It may be appropriate to point out that in the 1948 platform the Democratic Party promised statehood for Hawaii and Alaska immediately, and the Republican platform statehood for Hawaii and Alaska eventually.

The Hawaii Statehood Commission has made a compilation of the investigations of this question undertaken by Congress since 1935, showing that as a result more than 3,000 pages of testimony have been

taken and more than 600 witnesses heard on this question. I wish to call this to the committee's attention by way of pointing out that we will not undertake in our testimony to cover ground that has already received adequate consideration and, on the other hand, will direct our testimony to the issues that bear on the question of whether this legislation should be enacted at this time.

The attitude of the people of Hawaii on this question is well established. Our people are for immediate statehood by an overwhelming majority.

Some reference was made to the plebiscite in 1940 in which the vote was approximately 2 to 1 for statehood. I think that everyone will agree with me when I say that if a plebiscite were held on statehood, the vote would be at least 4 to 1 and probably 5 to 1. The results of the election of delegates to the constitutional convention that my predecessor, Mr. King, will present to you are complete and final evidence of that.

Furthermore, the people of Hawaii are quite determined to win statehood. We feel it is a matter of fair play and justice. We feel it is in the national interest.

Not the least manifestation of this is the fact that we have here for this hearing about 50 persons who have come to Washington from Hawaii and many more from points within the States to ask for statehood for Hawaii now.

We want this bill passed in this session of Congress.

The list of witnesses that has been presented to the committee includes leaders from all walks of our life: Political, economic, professional, and cultural. We hope to cover all of the main points at issue in the testimony of leaders from these groups. Their place in our community life is clear from the list that has been presented to the committee.

It is not our purpose to prolong this hearing unduly. Many of those who have been listed as witnesses probably will confine themselves only to a brief appearance and the filing of a statement. Mr. Chairman, we will follow the suggestion you made to us yesterday in that respect. They are here so you may understand how deeply we of Hawaii feel about this question and how anxious we are to answer any questions whatsoever that may be raised.

We want you to know that there are factors other than political and economic, the factors of the spirit and the feeling we have with regard to our future, the future of our Territory and our islands that enters very, very definitely into what we have to say.

So far as I know, there is not a single organization of any kind in the Territory of Hawaii which opposes statehood at this time. I am aware of certain individuals who are opposed to statehood and who are active in the opposition to it, but they are without organized support of any kind.

I want to say in that connection that there never was a time in the history of the islands when the people who were opposed to statehood did not feel free to so express themselves. As recently as the election of delegates to the constitutional convention, at least one candidate stood for election on the grounds that he was opposed to statehood for Hawaii.

There has not been any attempt to suppress discussion of this question or to penalize those who are opposed to it, and any contention to the contrary is without any foundation in fact.

Although statehood has been the objective of the people of Hawaii for many years and even before we became a Territory of the United States, the present effort to achieve statehood probably should be said, historically, to have had its beginning in 1932 when we were seriously confronted with the threat of losing the rights of government we enjoy under the Territorial form of government, as the result of the feeling aroused by the Massie case. I refer to this because one of the first witnesses we will call will be Seth W. Richardson who, as Assistant Attorney General of the United States at that time, conducted an extensive inquiry into law enforcement of the Territory, and in consequence of it presented to Congress a series of recommendations relating to our government that were subsequently rejected. I believe Mr. Richardson's point of view at this time on the question of statehood is deserving of special consideration.

In 1935 a subcommittee of the House Committee on Territories, at the instance of the then Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, Samuel Wilder King, conducted an investigation of this question in Hawaii and recommended an inquiry by a joint committee of Congress.

The latter materialized in 1937. Among those who participated in that inquiry were the present chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney of Wyoming, and former Senator Edward R. Burke, who is today counsel of the Hawaii Statehood Commission and who will also be called as a witness.

The joint committee recommended that statehood be postponed for reasons which witnesses will show have been met by the record of the war.

Immediately following the war, an investigation of the question of admitting Hawaii to the Union was undertaken by a subcommittee of the then House Committee on Territories. The chairman of the subcommittee was Representative Henry D. Larcade, of Louisiana, who is among the witnesses who are being called. The committee recommended immediate consideration of statehood for Hawaii after holding extensive hearings in the Islands.

The question was presented again to the Eightieth Congress. The new Committee on Public Lands held extensive hearings on the question and reported the bill to admit Hawaii to the Union as a State.

Among the witnesses were Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, and Maj. Gen. Charles D. Herron, who was in command of Hawaii just prior to Pearl Harbor. The testimony included reports on the conference with Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who informed a group of us that he supported statehood for Hawaii also.

The chairman of that committee was the late Representative Richard Welch of California. The ranking member of the committee and the present ranking minority member of the present committee was Representative Fred Crawford, of Michigan. We of Hawaii regard Mr. Crawford as one of the best-informed men in Congress on this issue and take pride in presenting him as one of our witnesses.

The question came under investigation under the direction of Senator Guy Cordon, of Oregon, by a subcommittee of the Senate Com-

mittee on Interior and Insular Affairs, early in 1948, and again was made the object of an investigation by a subcommittee of one of which Senator Hugh Butler of Nebraska was chairman, late in 1948. The report of the latter committee was made public in 1949. That is the Butler report.

The chairman of the House Committee on Public Lands which ordered this legislation reported last year is Representative J. Hardin Peterson, of Florida. We are proud indeed to have him appear as one of the witnesses in support of prompt enactment of this legislation by the Senate.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has just concluded an investigation of communism in Hawaii, and two of its members including the chairman of the special subcommittee and the ranking minority member, in fact I think three members, will be among the witnesses who will be called and be prepared to answer any questions raised.

The investigation was carried on over a period of 9 days and was preceded by an extensive inquiry into the problem of communism in the Territory of Hawaii that began well over a year ago.

The members of the committee who will appear are well able to inform your committee fully on the results of their investigation. We believe this will answer in full the questions raised on the report on this question made to the committee by Senator Butler in 1949. I am sure, Senator, you will be satisfied that that question has been adequately met by this investigation. We are confident that after hearing the report of this committee you will agree that this question no longer constitutes an obstacle to the admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State.

In conclusion I wish to say that I do not believe there is any aspect on this problem on which we cannot provide you with a prompt answer from someone in the group of persons who are present at this hearing.

We appeal to you to give us an opportunity to answer any question that you may have in your minds so that you may be in a position to come to some conclusion on this issue as the result of these hearings.

I would like to request that at the conclusion of all the testimony I be given an opportunity to make a closing statement for the purpose of covering any points that may not have been adequately met by the witnesses whom you will now hear.

I would like to present to the committee, Mr. Chairman, what is probably the last report on this subject that was referred to by Mr. Hickerson yesterday, the report of the subcommittee which investigated the government of the Pacific island this last November and December. They returned to Hawaii, and their emphasis was particularly on the importance of this issue to the future of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. You are referring to a House committee?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The report will be inserted in the record at this point along with the other documents that you have offered.

(The documents above referred to follow:)

STATEMENTS FAVORING STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII BY PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN

1. *January 21, 1946.*—Annual message on the state of the Union to joint session of Congress of the United States.

"I urge, too, that the Congress promptly accede to the wishes of the people of Hawaii that the Territory be admitted to statehood in our Union."

2. *February 28, 1947*.—As spokesman for President Truman, Secretary of Interior Julius A. Krug told the Hawaii Territorial Legislature that the President assured him just before he set out for Hawaii that he "was firmly behind Hawaiian statehood and would do everything he could to obtain it."

3. *January 7, 1948*.—Annual message on the state of the Union to joint session of Congress of the United States.

Prefacing his statement with the words, "Our first goal is to secure the essential human rights of our citizens," the President said:

"We should also consider our obligations to assure the fullest possible measure of civil rights to the peoples of our Territories and possessions. I believe the time has come for Alaska and Hawaii to be admitted to the Union as States."

4. *February 2, 1948*.—Message to House and Senate dealing with 10-point civil-rights program.

The President asked for legislation, among other things, to grant statehood for Hawaii.

5. *August 12, 1948*.—The President, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of Hawaii's annexation to the United States, sent a message to the people of Hawaii, through the Governor, as follows:

"Please convey to the people of Hawaii my best wishes on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of Annexation Day and reaffirm my strong faith in Hawaii's readiness for immediate statehood.

"Every effort possible will be made to fulfill the people's expressed wishes for statehood, a goal they richly deserve and one mutually beneficial to Hawaii and the rest of the Nation."

6. *January 5, 1949*.—Annual message on the state of the Union to joint session of Congress of the United States:

"The civil-rights proposals I made to the Eightieth Congress, I now repeat to the Eighty-first Congress. They should be enacted in order that the Federal Government may assume the leadership and discharge the obligations clearly placed upon it by the Constitution.

"I stand squarely behind those proposals." (NOTE.—Civil-rights proposals referred to include statehood for Hawaii.)

7. *January 14, 1949*.—President Truman today personally assured Delegate Joseph R. Farrington, of Hawaii, of his intention to continue to work for statehood for Hawaii.

8. *March 12, 1949*.—The President wrote to the chairman of the Hawaii Statehood Commission, Mr. A. T. Longley, in Honolulu, as follows:

"I wish to thank you for your letter of January 9, in which you express appreciation for the support I have given to the people of Hawaii in their efforts to attain statehood.

"I attach great importance to the enactment by the Congress at its present session of legislation to enable Hawaii to become a State. This measure has my unqualified endorsement and is receiving my personal attention and active support.

"I am aware of the important contribution which the Hawaii Statehood Commission has made toward the attainment by Hawaii of statehood. Please extend to the members of the commission my best wishes."

9. *January 4, 1950*.—Annual message on the state of the Union to joint session of Congress of the United States:

"I again urge the Congress to enact the civil-rights proposals I made in February 1948. These are proposals for the enactment of Federal statutes which will protect all our people in the exercise of their democratic rights and their search for economic opportunity, grant statehood to Alaska and Hawaii * * *."

It should be pointed out that at various press conferences held by the President the subject of statehood for Hawaii has been raised by reporters; at each instance the President has said emphatically that he still favors statehood for Hawaii.

Record of congressional investigations of statehood for Hawaii, 1935-49

Dates of hearings	Site of hearings	Days of hearings	Committee membership	Members visiting Hawaii	Witnesses for statehood	Witnesses against statehood	Number of witnesses	States represented by committee membership	Pages of printed hearings and reports
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1. Oct. 7-18, 1935.....	Hawaii.....	12	6	5	90	15	105	5	343
2. Oct. 6-22, 1937.....	do.....	17	25	19	47	19	66	23	835
3. Jan. 7-18, 1946.....	do.....	12	6	5	91	16	107	4	909
4. Mar. 7-19, 1947.....	Washington.....	13	27	0	35	0	35	20	350
5. Jan. 5-20, 1948.....	Hawaii.....	16	5	1	215	16	231	5	461
6. Apr. 15, 1948 ¹	Washington.....	1	13	0	8	0	8	5	53
7. Nov. 1-12, 1948.....	Hawaii.....	11	13	1	(²)	(²)	77	11	³ 15
8. Mar. 3 and 8, 1949..	Washington.....	2	26	0	4	0	4	19	⁴ 77
Total.....	-----	84	121	⁵ 31	490	66	⁶ 633	⁷ 92	⁸ 3,043

¹ Testimony appears in printed hearings held Jan. 5-20, 1948.

² Data not available.

³ The report of Senator Hugh Butler (Republican, Nebraska) recommended statehood be deferred indefinitely, "until communism in the Territory may be brought under effective control."

⁴ The report of the House Public Lands Committee recommended statehood; of the 18 committee members present, only 1 dissented, and that individual voted for the bill when it later passed the House on Mar. 7, 1950.

⁵ Not including Hawaii's Delegate to Congress.

⁶ Witnesses presenting only written statements not included in total.

⁷ Representing 36 different States.

⁸ Approximately equal to the number of pages in 15 average-length books.

NOTE.—Committees reporting on investigations of statehood for Hawaii in January 1946, March 1947, January 1948, and March 1949 urged that Hawaii be made a State.

NATIONAL PARTY PLANKS ON STATEHOOD ¹

1900

DEMOCRATIC

"We are not opposed to Territorial expansion when it takes in desirable territory which can erected into States in the Union, and whose people are willing and fit to become American citizens. We favor expansion by every peaceful and legitimate means."

Promised immediate statehood to Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma, and took stand favoring home rule for Territories.

REPUBLICAN

1904

Immediate statehood for Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma.

Administrative officials of any Territory "should be bona fide residents of that Territory."

¹ Planks for years 1900-36 from hearings before the Joint Committee on Hawaii, Seventy-fifth Congress, second session, October 6 to 22, 1937 (Washington: Government Printing Office), pp. 557-559; planks for years 1940-48 from hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on the Territories, House of Representatives, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, January 7-18, 1946 (Washington: Government Printing Office), pp. 896-897.

1908

Immediate statehood for Arizona and New Mexico.

Administrative officials of all "Territories" should be thoroughly qualified by previous bona fide residence."

Application of land laws to Hawaii and promotion of homesteads.

Immediate statehood for New Mexico and Arizona.

Territorial officials "should be bona fide residents of the Territory in which their duties are to be performed."

1912

"Officials appointed to administer the government of all our Territories * * * should be qualified by previous bona fide residence."

1916

Territorial officials "should be qualified by previous bona fide residence."

Bona fide residents for Territorial officials.

1920

Full Territorial government for Puerto Rico and Alaska, "with view to ultimate statehood accorded to all Territories of the United States since the beginning of our Government."

Bona fide residence for Territorial officials.

"For Hawaii we recommend Federal assistance in Americanizing and educating her greatly disproportionate foreign population, home rule, and the rehabilitation of the Hawaiian race."

1924

Territorial self-government for Alaska.

Favored Federal assistance in harbor improvements for Hawaii, the appropriation of its share of Federal funds, and extension of homesteads for Hawaiian race.

1928

"We favor appointment only of bona fide residents to office in the Territories."

Territorial government for Puerto Rico, "with a view to ultimate statehood."

1932

Ultimate statehood for Puerto Rico.

"We believe that the customary status of self-government * * * enjoyed by * * * the Territory of Hawaii should be maintained, and that officials * * * should be bona fide residents of the Territory."

1940

"We favor a larger measure of self-government leading to statehood for Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. We favor the appointment of residents to office and equal treatment of the citizens of each of these three Territories. We favor the prompt determination and payment of any just claims by Indians and Eskimos, citizens of Alaska, against the United States."

"Hawaii, sharing the Nation's obligations equally with the several States, is entitled to the fullest measure of home rule and to equality with the several States in the right of her citizens and in the application of our national laws."

1944

"We favor enactment of legislation granting the fullest measure of self-government for Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, and eventual statehood for Alaska and Hawaii."

"Hawaii, which shares the Nation's obligations equally with the several States, is entitled to the fullest measure of home rule looking toward statehood and to equality with the several States in the rights of her citizens and the application of all our national laws."

1946

(Resolution of national committee,
May 1946)

"Whereas the Republican Party in its national platform has supported policies looking toward ultimate statehood for Hawaii;

"Whereas the people of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question their loyalty, patriotism, and, by an overwhelming vote, their desire to assume the responsibilities of statehood;

"Whereas the capacity of the people of this Territory to assume the responsibilities of State government has been fully demonstrated; and

"Whereas the admission of the Territory of Hawaii as the forty-ninth State would be in fulfillment of a promise long made, is in keeping with a policy of self-determination, and would strengthen the position of this country in the Pacific: Be it further

"Resolved, That the Republican National Committee endorse the effort of the people of Hawaii to obtain immediate statehood."

1948

"We urge immediate statehood for Hawaii and Alaska; immediate determination by the people of Puerto Rico as to their form of government * * *."

"We favor eventual statehood for Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico."

National organizations adopting resolutions supporting statehood for Hawaii

Association	Convention held	Dates
1. American Legion.....	San Francisco, Calif.....	February 1946.
2. American National Livestock Association.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	September 1949.
3. American Veterans Committee.....	Boise, Idaho.....	Jan. 13-15, 1948.
4. American Water Works Association.....	National convention, Des Moines, Iowa.....	June 14-16, 1946.
5. Association of State and Territorial Health Officers.....	National convention, New York.....	June 1948.
6. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, board of directors.....	April 1946.
7. Committee for Maritime Unity (went out of existence in 1949).....	Annual meeting.....	Nov. 22, 1946; Apr. 28, 1948.
8. Congress of Industrial Organizations, executive board.....	San Francisco.....	May 6-11, 1946.
9. Congress of the National Society of Delta Sigma Rho.....	May 17-19, 1949.
10. Disabled American Veterans.....	National convention, Chicago, Ill.....	Apr. 10-12, 1947.
11. General Conference of the Methodist Church.....	Convention, Las Vegas, Nev.....	Apr. 4, 1949.
12. General Council of Congregational Christian Churches.....	Convention, New York, N. Y.....	Aug. 17-23, 1947.
13. Governors' National Conference.....	Convention, Cleveland, Ohio.....	Aug. 15-21, 1948.
14. International Association for Identification.....	Boston, Mass.....	Aug. 15-21, 1949.
15. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.....	Convention, Oberlin, Ohio.....	May 10, 1948.
16. Kiwanis Club.....	Salt Lake City, Utah.....	July 17, 1947.
17. Lions International.....	Portsmouth, N. H.....	June 13-16, 1948.
18. National Association of Real Estate Boards.....	Colorado Springs, Colo.....	June 22, 1949.
19. National Association of Sanitarians.....	Rochester, N. Y.....	July 18, 1946.
20. National Education Association.....	7th biennial convention, San Francisco, Calif.....	Apr. 7-11, 1947.
21. National Federation of Women's Republican Clubs.....	36th annual convention, Los Angeles, Calif.....	June 6-10, 1948.
22. National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	July 20, 1946.
23. National Labor Executive Association (motion).....	New York City.....	July 29, 1948.
24. Republican National Committee.....	Atlantic City, N. J.....	Nov. 15, 1946.
25. Soroptimists Clubs.....	14th annual convention, Salt Lake City, Utah.....	Sept. 15-17, 1947.
26. United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, board of directors.....	Convention at Buffalo, N. Y.....	July 1946.
27. Veterans of Foreign Wars.....	Convention at Chicago, Ill.....	March 1947.
28. World Trade Committee.....	55th Continental Congress, Atlantic City, N. J.....	May 20-23, 1946.
29. Young Women's Christian Association.....	Apr. 27, 1949.
30. Zonta Clubs of America.....	Washington, D. C.....	April 1946.
31. Attorneys General Association.....
32. National Grange.....	Tulsa, Okla.....	Aug. 21, 1947.
	St. Louis, Mo.....	Aug. 29-Sept. 3, 1948.
	Miami, Fla.....	Aug. 21-Sept. 26, 1949.
	San Francisco.....	February 1947.
	Swampscott, Mass.....	Mar. 14, 1949.
	St. Paul, Minn.....	June 1946.
	Sacramento, Calif.....	Oct. 13, 1949.
		Nov. 23, 1949.

(The committee print of January 10, 1950, addressed to Hon. J. Hardin Peterson, chairman, Committee on Public Lands, House of Representatives, is as follows:)

[Committee print]

JANUARY 10, 1950.

HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Public Lands,
House of Representatives,

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your Special Committee on Pacific Territories and Island Possessions strongly urges that steps be taken to bring to a vote immediately H. R. 49, the bill to admit Hawaii to the Union as a State. This measure has been pending on the House Calendar since last March, when it was reported by the Committee on Public Lands with only one dissenting vote.

En route to Samoa, the Trust Territory, Guam, and the Far East the committee stopped for 2 days at Honolulu. The headquarters of the Pacific Fleet Command and the government of the Trust Territory is stationed there. The officials charged with the government of Samoa, the Trust Territory, and Guam

have drawn heavily upon the experience and the personnel of Hawaii in meeting many of their most important problems in the field of education, science, and agriculture. In traveling through these islands the committee found in many places the results of the very important influence being exerted by Hawaii. People of the Pacific look to Hawaii in many respects much as the French do to Paris, the British to London, and Americans to Washington and New York. It is unquestionably one of the principal cultural centers of the Pacific and recognized as such by those who have been charged with the responsibility for the administration of our Pacific possessions.

On its return from Tokyo the committee spent 4 days in Hawaii. Its members met with the principal public officials of the Territory and leaders in every field of civic activities. The committee was a guest at a community luncheon organized by the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce and conferred at length with members of the Hawaii Statehood Commission, an official agency of the Territorial government charged with the responsibility of promoting statehood for Hawaii.

The committee found Hawaii more aggressively determined to achieve statehood than at any time in the past. The overwhelming majority of people with whom its members talked expressed themselves emphatically in favor of the admission of Hawaii to the Union, believing this would serve not only the best interest of the Territory but of the United States.

This point of view has been strengthened rather than weakened by the serious economic situation that has resulted first from the sharp reductions of the Military and Naval Establishment in Hawaii and second from a strike of longshoremen that lasted for a period of almost 6 months. The Territory is preparing to deal vigorously with the serious problem of unemployment that was brought about by the former development and take pride in the action of its legislature which brought about a resumption of stevedoring operations and at least a limited amount of shipping during the period of the longshoremen's strike. The emphasis given to local responsibility by the Federal administration and the Congress in meeting these problems has caused people in Hawaii to feel more strongly than ever that the additional local authority and greater representation in Washington that would come with statehood should be granted at once.

Prompt enactment of H. R. 49 will strengthen the position of this country among people of the Pacific islands and the Far East. Many of these people regard the future with great apprehension. The advances of communism and the uncertainties as to what course this country might pursue to meet these advances in the Pacific has filled them with grave doubts. That they look to the United States for leadership in meeting this problem and all of the threat that it holds for the freedom inherent in the democratic way of life is unmistakable. The committee found evidences of this both in the principal centers of population in the islands of the South and Central Pacific and in the Orient. These people are anxious to be reassured that the influence of this country will be exerted to the fullest in support of their efforts to achieve and sustain the freedom inherent in democracy.

The prompt admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State will be notice to the people of the Pacific and to the world that this country intends in no sense to retreat from its position of leadership in the Pacific, won at a great cost in World War II, and on the contrary proposes that every legitimate step be taken to preserve and strengthen the objectives achieved in that struggle.

It will be reassuring to the friends of democracy. The United States will give them a practical demonstration of its belief in the democratic system of government by admitting Hawaii to the Union as a State and its people, thereby, to the full privileges of American citizenship. This example will be of far-reaching influence in Japan, the Philippines, Korea, and China, from whence many of Hawaii's people, now American citizens of long residence in the islands, originally migrated.

It will provide an effective answer to Communist propaganda that is undertaking to persuade the people of the Pacific, and particularly the Far East, that there are racial barriers in the American system of government that militate against people of oriental origin.

It will serve to bring the people of Hawaii into closer relationship to the people of the rest of the country and the latter to a full appreciation of our responsibilities in the Pacific.

Hawaii has long been a proving ground of the American way of life. It has been a lighthouse of democracy in the Pacific. Its relationship to the Pacific

and the Far East has been and is today important to the future of our country in this great area. It is both a gateway to the Pacific and the Far East and a common meeting ground of the divergent cultures of Occident and the Orient.

Your committee therefore recommends that the promise of statehood long held out to the people of Hawaii be promptly fulfilled. It believes that action at this time is in the national interest.

JOHN E. MILES,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
WILLIAM LEMKE,
JAY LEFEVRE,
GEORGE I. MILLER,
EDWARD H. JENISON.
JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON,

Chairman.

Delegate from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Senator Knowland was our first witness. He has already made his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Before we proceed to any other witness, Delegate Farrington, I shall ask the members of the committee if they have any questions to propound at this time.

Senator Butler?

Senator BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, Delegate Farrington referred at the close of his statement to the report that I made in 1949 as a result of a visit that I made to Hawaii in 1948, and I think it has been well understood that the only objection that I have considered to date as a valid objection to statehood for Hawaii is the question of communism and communistic control, and I would like, Mr. Chairman, to ask Delegate Farrington if he can give us some information—you do not need to do it now if you do not have it; I doubt if you have it—with reference to the Territorial Democratic Convention that was held there I believe, as you know.

The question is this: Is the left-wing element of the party, was it in control of that Territorial convention? Do you have a list of the nominees that were made at that convention so that it will help us in weighing the testimony that may be introduced later along the lines that you have just stated?

In your opinion, the question of communism has been pretty well taken care of. There are some, of course, who have a little doubt on that score. One of them is the former chief justice, James L. Coke, who I think had expected to be a witness, but is not, I understand, now going to be heard.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Senator, I am glad you raised that point at this time. We will develop the argument that we believe we will be better able to contend with that problem as a State than as a Territory.

We have in our delegation here some of the leading Democrats of the Territory; in fact the men who I regard as the leading Democrats, and I am sure they will be glad to inform you fully on that.

Senator BUTLER. I will make it very plain, Mr. Delegate, that so far as I am concerned, there is not a particle of partisanship in any consideration of this question, and I do not think that there will be at any time. There has not been up to date.

It just happened that my report made the point that the Bridges-Hall element had gotten control of the Democratic Party organization that was not in accordance with the desire of the real Democrats; I am sure of that. They did have the control, and what I would like

to have brought up to date is whether they still have that control as shown by the convention that was held there recently.

Mr. FARRINGTON. We will provide you with that information.

Senator BUTLER. And a list of their nominees.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not prepared at the moment to provide that?

Mr. FARRINGTON. We will provide it later today I am sure.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Butler, you referred to a communication from Judge Coke. Do you care to make that part of the record?

Senator BUTLER. I will be glad to.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you read it please?

Senator BUTLER. It is addressed to me. It came yesterday. I think it was sent from Honolulu on the 30th. It says:

Your position on Hawaiian statehood vindicated completely here today. Democratic Territorial Convention taken over again by Bridges-Hall left-wing forces by 2-to-1 vote. Not at all improbable this element will similarly control State if statehood granted Hawaii.

JAMES L. COKE, *Former Chief Justice.*

Mr. FARRINGTON. I appreciate particularly your presenting that issue at this time, as it will prepare us to meet it with the Hawaiian witnesses who will follow our congressional witnesses, if that is agreeable to you.

(Senator Hugh Butler subsequently supplied the following additional information from Judge Coke:)

MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED BY SENATOR BUTLER

Former Chief Justice James L. Coke has presented two statements in the form of letters to me which are submitted for the hearings. The letters are submitted intact except for the deletion of personal references and of repetitious material.

The following biographical data on Judge Coke are submitted to give the background of his career.

He was born on the west coast of Oregon and migrated to Hawaii as a young man, arriving in Honolulu August 8, 1898, and has resided in Hawaii ever since. He is a lawyer by profession. In 1908 he was elected by popular vote prosecuting attorney of the county of Maui; moved to Honolulu in 1910 and in 1912 was elected a Territorial senator representing the city and county of Honolulu in the legislature. A very short time following the end of his term as senator in 1916, he was appointed one of the three circuit judges of Honolulu. In the following year, he was promoted to the office of associate justice of the Territorial supreme court and, after serving about 1½ years, was appointed chief justice of the supreme court, serving his full 4-year term. In 1934, he was again appointed chief justice of the Territorial supreme court and served for something over 6 years, at which time he voluntarily retired because of the demands of private business which required all of his time. He also served as chairman of the governor's fact finding board for the purpose of endeavoring to settle the long-shoremen's strike which was called last spring and which was finally settled last fall.

HONOLULU 13, T. H., April 26, 1950.

HON. HUGH BUTLER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: I regret exceedingly my inability to appear before the committee and furnish what I consider ample reasons why the enactment of the proposed legislation should be deferred, but the financial sacrifice to defray the expense of the trip is more than, in fairness to myself, I can afford to assume.

Let me point out that the statehood advocates have for a number of years been able to put through the legislature large appropriations of public funds to meet every conceivable expense which in their opinion might further their end, the last appropriation being \$250,000, which I understand is now about exhausted. This lavish expenditure, and I perhaps should say extravagance, will be apparent

to the members of your committee when it convenes next Monday and observe the horde of statehood supporters who are in the National Capital at the expense of the taxpayers of Hawaii. This obvious attempt to frighten the Senate committee by force of numbers called for a protest by former senator, Harold Rice, a member of the statehood commission, which appeared on the front page of the Honolulu Advertiser on Tuesday, April 25, and entitled, "Rice Calls Statehood Exodus 'Big Junket' ". Then, it goes on to say, "Harold W. Rice, a former Maui senator and delegate to the constitutional convention threw that body into a turmoil when he labeled the statehood exodus to Washington as one of the biggest junkets that has ever been pulled off so far as this Territory is concerned."

Also, that while the statehood commission can afford to pay the expenses of what Senator Rice calls a junket, its chairman, Mr. King, refused point blank to permit the expenditure of a single dime for the purpose of hearing even a single individual representing the many thousands of local residents who believe as I do that statehood for Hawaii at the present time would be a colossal blunder and might turn out to be a tragic one.

There is a great probability that the Philippine Islands will fall into the hands of the communistic rule within a very short time, and, in this connection, the Senate committee ought to be interested in the fact that the disastrous long-shoremen's strike of 1949 here in Honolulu was composed of more than 74 percent of Filipinos.

It is freely predicted by those having knowledge of the situation that Japan will go communistic as soon as the restraining hand of General MacArthur is removed. At the last election in Japan, the Communists cast more than 3,500,000 votes and elected 35 members of the National Diet, all of which is a tremendous increase over their former strength, although just prior to the election we were assured that there were no Communists in Japan.

With this Red army at our back door and gradually moving closer to us, can we afford to set Hawaii up as a State out in the middle of the Pacific Ocean with no Federal control—a State which may very promptly go under the domination of officials from governor down who are far more friendly to Moscow than to Washington? I do not say that this will happen, but I do say that it can happen. Hence, I insist that it is utterly irrational for us to assume the risk and danger of statehood at this time, and I confess my utter inability to account for the support of this legislation by such members of the national Senate as Senators Cordon and Knowland.

The Un-American Activities Committee of the lower House discovered a number of known Communists here in Hawaii, most of whom refused to divulge their political alliance by refusing to admit or deny that they were or are members of the Communist Party and took refuge behind their presumed constitutional immunity. There are undoubtedly hundreds of other Communists in Hawaii who were not located. The actual number will never be known because all Communists are taught to deny their identity, but they are here in sufficient force to become a menace, and, in this connection, there appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser of Sunday, April 23, 1950, an editorial which is one of the most astounding articles, coming as it does from a paper supporting statehood, that has come to my attention. I quote as follows:

"COMMUNISTS' NUMBERS UNIMPORTANT

"Harping on the small number of Communists witnesses at the recent Un-American Activities Committee hearing were able to say reside in Hawaii is misleading. The Communist cell system prevents one group of party members from knowing the number or the identity of their comrades in sedition. What is important is that the Communists and their fellow travelers here had sufficient strength to seize and hold the Democratic Party machinery.

"Whether there are 130 Communists in Hawaii or 1,300 has little significance. Some estimates place the total number of Communist card holders in the whole United States at only 200,000. Postwar investigations have shown that Hitler controlled Germany with a handful of Nazis. Mussolini dominated Italy with a small group of Fascists.

"In subversive treachery it is what is done, not how many persons do it, that tells the story. Even one Communist in Hawaii who can deceive innocent Americans into disloyalty is one too many."

This statement supports 100 percent the contention which those of us here who are fearful of statehood have been preaching for years—that is to say, that a comparatively small number of trained Communists can wield tremendous power, exactly as they did here in Honolulu 2 years ago when the radical group took

over the entire domination of the Territorial Democratic Convention composed of about 500 of us. I know personally that this took place because I was a delegate and attended the convention.

One of the most fallacious representations sponsored by the proponents of statehood is to the effect that as a State Hawaii could much more effectively control communism within its borders. Possibly that statement would be true if the control of the State remain in the hands of loyal Americans, but let that control be taken over by a Communist group, then Hawaii is sunk. The Federal Government would have little legal constitutional power to control the State, but Congress would while Hawaii remains a Territory have plenary authority to do so.

Jack Hall, of Honolulu, closely allied locally with Mr. Harry Bridges and repeatedly in the recent hearing and investigation before the Un-American Activities Committee of Congress was identified by witnesses as a member of the Communist Party here in Hawaii and who has for a number of years been the direct representative in the Hawaiian Islands of Mr. Bridges, made a public speech in the grounds of Iolani Palace in Honolulu on Labor Day, on September 3, 1947, before a large crowd. In that address, he said, "and never for a second forget that statehood for Hawaii is our most important political objective. We ache for statehood; for self-determination." Grant statehood and undoubtedly Mr. Hall and his kind will give fervent thanks that their prayer has been answered.

With cordial regards and sincere best wishes, I have the honor to remain

Yours respectfully,

JAMES L. COKE.

HONOLULU 13, T. H., May 8, 1950.

Senator HUGH BUTLER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: In my letter of April 27 I submitted to you a memorandum, dated April 26, setting forth some of the more important arguments against statehood for Hawaii at the present time, the focal point being the danger of the State coming under Communist control, and to me, it is downright amazing how such men as Secretary of the Interior Chapman, Delegate Farrington, and others have attempted to belittle and brush aside this obvious danger. I do not know and neither does the Secretary of the Interior nor anyone else know how many Communists there are in Hawaii.

I, of course, know that not all of what is known as the left-wing element of the Democratic Party here are Communists, but I do know that the left-wing members took over the domination of the party 2 years ago and are in control at the present time in greater strength than they were at that time. I further know that the left-wing group, by a huge majority, voted to seat 15 delegates who had just recently appeared before a subcommittee of the House of Representatives having the power of subpoena and examination, hid behind what they claim as their constitutional immunity, declined to answer whether they are now or have been members of the Communist Party.

I was a delegate to the convention, and I felt so outraged at the action of the convention in seating these delegates that I immediately left the convention and did not return. This was before the walk-out of about a hundred other delegates to the convention, led by Mr. Harold Rice.

I have tried in the past to emphasize the point that the Communists of the East are moving rapidly toward Hawaii. They have recently taken over the island of Hainan, and everybody knows that with Russian assistance they can take over the island of Formosa at any time they elect to do so. It is likewise well known that the Philippine Islands are right on the brink of communism. It is also freely predicted that as soon as General MacArthur moves out of Japan that country will move into the ranks of the Communists. A press dispatch, dated May 6, has just come in from Tokyo. A part reads as follows:

"A member of Gen. Douglas MacArthur's legal staff outlined to the Japan Civil Liberties Union today his case for curbing communism in Japan as constituting a graver threat than the war lords of World War II."

Also, in the Honolulu Advertiser, a local daily paper, issued today, we have on page 16 a photograph just received from Japan which shows a meeting in Tokyo, consisting of a crowd of 200,000, to hear Mr. Sanzo Nozaka, a Communist Party leader, deliver his May Day address.

If we were living in normal times, objection to statehood would carry much less weight, but conditions throughout the world are not only abnormal, but are fraught with the gravest danger to our national life. By retaining Hawaii as a Territory, the Federal Government through Congress could in a moment's time

make any change it considers conducive to the national security. On the other hand, if Hawaii is a State, all power having to do with the internal affairs of the State would be under the control of the State government. " * * * The States are sovereign within their separate spheres as to all powers not delegated to the United States or prohibited to the States, and subject to these restrictions each State is supreme, and possesses the exclusive right of regulating its own internal affairs * * *"—see *New Hampshire v. Louisiana* (108 U. S. 76; 44 Cent. Dig., title "States," sec 1, et seq.) ; *State v. Hanson* (113 N. W. 371).

It is, therefore, apparent that if Hawaii should become a State and should fall under the control of the Communists the increased danger to the United States of America and to Hawaii would be obvious.

During the last administration of President Cleveland we had a railway men's strike, which among other things prevented the movement of United States mail. The President, in order to secure the passage of mail, communicated with the different governors of the several States requesting that they endeavor to prevent the unlawful stoppage of the mail in transit through their respective States. One such message was sent to Governor Penneyer of the State of Oregon. To this timely request Governor Penneyer replied to President Cleveland as follows: "Attend to your business, and I will attend to mine."

In numerous instances, the proponents of statehood have grossly misrepresented the facts to the Senate committee at the recent hearing. As an illustration, they have repeatedly endeavored to lead the committee to believe that during the period of annexation in 1898, the people of Hawaii were promised statehood. I was present at the ceremonies of annexation on August 12, 1898, and have lived in Hawaii continuously ever since. I listened to the address of the American Minister Harold M. Sewall accepting surrender of the islands in behalf of the United States of America. He said nothing whatsoever that could be interpreted as a promise of subsequent statehood. The three American Commissioners, Senator Morgan of Alabama, Senator Cullum of Illinois, and Congressman Hitt of Illinois, at no time pretended to commit the Federal Government to the idea of statehood and at no time since has any official of the United States with authority to speak on the subject made any such commitment until just recently when, for reasons unknown, the present administration seems to be afflicted with a phobia based upon wholly groundless fear that something dreadful will happen to Hawaii if it is not promptly granted statehood and this notwithstanding the fact that Hawaii has prospered for more than 50 years under a territorial form of government and fared much better than many States of the Union.

Much has truthfully been said about the racial harmony existing in Hawaii. This condition will, I believe, continue in the Territory, but it is my fear that amity will cease if Hawaii becomes a State and all of our executive, judicial, and administrative officers here are elective.

Another erroneous representation by the proponents of statehood is the gross underestimation of the number of Communists in Hawaii and belittling their danger to the community. The same thing happened 2 years ago at which time the word repeatedly came out of Tokyo that the number of Communists in continental Japan was negligible. But shortly thereafter a national election was held in Japan, at which there were 3,500,000 Communist votes cast, electing 35 members of the of the National Diet.

With highest regards and very kind best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

JAMES L. COKE.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Anderson, do you have any questions?

Senator ANDERSON. No. There is a statement in here that "there was an investigation by a joint committee, and that committee recommended that statehood be postponed for reasons which witnesses will show have been met by the record of the war."

I assume that will be a subsequent witness.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes, but I can give you the answer in one sentence. The committee recommended first that a determination be made of the attitude of the people in Hawaii on the question of statehood and a plebiscite was held in 1940 as the result. It was also recommended that the issue be deferred until the international situation clarified, having some doubt as to the loyalty of our people, and I

think that was answered by the record of our people during the war. That is my recollection, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be appropriate for me to state, since I was a member of that joint committee, that, as my recollection serves me, one of the most important issues raised during that period was the issue of dual citizenship on the part of Japanese nationals.

It was represented to our joint committee that the Japanese Government claimed for its nationals the right to retain Japanese citizenship while adopting citizenship in the United States. There was a great deal of testimony with respect to that, and it raised a very serious doubt in the minds of the members of the joint committee. I think that was the influential circumstance in persuading the joint committee to recommend postponement of the proposal.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes; I think that issue very manifestly was dissolved by the results of the war.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Lehman, have you any questions?

Senator LEHMAN. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Taylor?

Senator TAYLOR. I have no questions at this point, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Delegate Farrington, in your opening statement you spoke of the witnesses who are to appear as being prepared to meet all of the arguments which have been advanced against statehood. Did I understand you correctly?

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Therefore, you must have made a review of those arguments?

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you care to state, in your study of the matter and the struggle you have had in the House, what have been the principal arguments raised against statehood so that the committee may know now what points your witnesses plan to discuss?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I will review them very briefly, Senator.

The first is the question of whether the Territorial status carried the implied promise of statehood. We believe that it did. We believe that we were promised and have been promised statehood. That point is a matter of some dispute.

Another question is that of noncontiguity. Some people object to the admission as a State of an area which is not contiguous to the continent.

I recognize that those who hold that point of view are quite sincere in feeling that Statehood for Hawaii will offer a precedent that will plague the country in the future.

The third issue is the character of the people of Hawaii. My opinion is that that goes right to the heart of this question, that fundamentally the opposition to statehood comes from people who do not believe our people are good American citizens.

Now, we feel that question very, very deeply because our population has been drawn from all parts of the Pacific, as you know. We have under the American flag in Hawaii more people of the Japanese race, more people of the Chinese race, more people of the Filipino race, more people of the Korean race, and more people of the Pacific island race than the rest of the country today. The people of Hawaii are American citizens, but those of the same race in their homeland are watching the deliberations of this Congress on this question.

To them it will be the measure of our attitude on the position they will have in a democratic system of government. So we have brought to these hearings people representing all aspects of our life. Many of them have attained positions of prominence. They will give you something of the spirit in which we approach this issue.

Finally, opposition will come to statehood on the grounds of communism. It will be contended that we are not capable of dealing with this problem as a State.

We recognize that communism is a problem with us. But some people contend and I concede their sincerity, that this problem can be dealt with more effectively under the territorial form of government, with Congress in control, and the administration in control of our executive and judicial branches of Government, than it can if we are given the responsibility of statehood which is irrevocable.

I hope that the committee will inquire into the record of our legislature last spring when we were pleading here for help from Congress and other sources to contend with the strike of the longshoremen.

We have the president of our senate and the speaker of our house. They will give you the answers to any questions you may raise in that connection.

I think, Senator, other than some corollary points, that covers the main points of opposition. I did not mean to answer them while I was presenting them.

The CHAIRMAN. I think your statement was quite adequate. What is the present status with respect to the constitutional convention already started?

Mr. FARRINGTON. The legislature in its regular session last year enacted a law authorizing the holding of an election and the calling of a constitutional convention to draft a State constitution, and they provided the funds necessary to do so.

Incidentally, the original bill anticipated that Congress would pay the cost of this election and convention, but we are paying for it now. The elections were held in February and March. We chose 63 delegates to the convention and the convention met on April 4. The president of the convention, my distinguished predecessor, Samuel Wilder King, is here to tell you about it. I want to say that we are particularly proud of the record of that election and the character of the people——

The CHAIRMAN. Will he testify in respect to that convention?

Mr. FARRINGTON. He will testify as to the details of it. We hope that this bill will be enacted in such form that the deliberations of that convention will be given the full force of law and that the constitution that comes out of it will be the constitution of the State of Hawaii.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidence was given yesterday of the unemployment in Hawaii. Have you any comment to make upon that, particularly from the point of view of what the effect of statehood will be upon meeting the problems which give rise to unemployment?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Well, of course, in a general way the same factors apply in that situation as they do in others.

Under State government, greater emphasis is given to local responsibility. There is no disposition now, and there should not be, to defer

to Washington for the solution of this problem—a habit we can well get into if we continue as a Territory but if we become a State and greater force will be given to the representation that we make in Congress by reason of the privilege of voting in the Senate and the House.

Unemployment probably constitutes our most serious problem at the present time. I think we are fully capable of dealing with it whether we are a Territory or a State.

I do not believe it is an issue in the consideration of this legislation, except that it reflects general economic conditions in the islands which have caused our payment of taxes into the Federal Treasury to drop below what they have been in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. Will somebody be prepared to discuss the economic situation in the islands, the opportunities which are presented for employment, and the like?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Who will be that witness?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Well, I had hoped to have Dr. Shoemaker here in order to discuss that question. He is in Honolulu, and it may be that he can be brought up here for that purpose.

Mr. KING. He was unable to come, but there are others.

The CHAIRMAN. If it is possible, I hope that he will be brought here.

Senator LEHMAN. In the hearings on Alaska, in the proposal for statehood, great stress was laid upon the fact that statehood would facilitate defense. Do you take the same position?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes; in this respect: In the final analysis the strength of any country is in the character of its people. I think the record of the Philippines is very much in point in dealing with the people of Hawaii.

When Japan invaded the Philippines, the people of the Philippines resisted, and they resisted to the end because they were living in the promise made by this country that some day they would be free men. The record of the war, and particularly that of the Japanese-Americans in Hawaii who were under suspicion, dramatically demonstrates the influence of the promise of freedom, of equality, such as we see in the question of statehood for Hawaii, on the conduct of the population of any given area.

I think that there is no question that our hope for statehood and the promise of equality that it holds for our people was a great source of inspiration and of strength. Every man who had a position of responsibility in the Military Establishment in Hawaii on December 7 will tell you that it was the civilian population that saved Hawaii in its hour of greatest need. The people were almost as one man to protect their country—America. I believe this was the result of long training in the responsibilities and meaning of American citizenship—of the same spirit that moves us in the fight for statehood.

I say, Senator Lehman, that this is what makes a country strong, and I say that when you enhance the position of a people, make them free, give them equality, then you have an element of strength that really counts in the national defense.

I would also say that national defense will not suffer representation in the Senate from Hawaii. In fact, I am sure that representation from Hawaii will be of great value. It will emphasize the de-

fense needs of the Pacific and bring to the Senate a consciousness of our problem out there that may not be present at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. You speak of freedom and the aspirations of the people for freedom. It inspires me to remarks that another aspect of the hearings of 1937 had to do with the evidence that was presented there on the part of some, alleging that economic freedom was not as complete in the islands as it should be. Will that be discussed by your witnesses?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes. One of the objections raised to statehood for Hawaii, prior to the war particularly, was that our life was dominated by what is known as the Big Five. I think that situation has been brought into balance by the organization of labor.

I know there are many aspects of the labor situation that are objects of criticism at the present time and have raised very serious doubts, for reasons which Senator Butler has pointed out. I believe, however, that this is a phase in our development that is in the exact pattern of what has happened in other parts of the country. It is one that will run its course and disappear. It happened in coal, it happened in steel, it happened in automobiles, where, in the early days of organization, a very conservative management was confronted with an extremely militant unionism. I have not any doubt in my mind that with the passing of time, the working men and women of Hawaii will meet the problems that have been presented by infiltration of Communists. I believe this answers any argument that the Big Five runs Hawaii. Incidentally, we have representatives of the Big Five, if you choose to call them such, here as witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that the attitude of the economic leaders of the islands is now such as to inspire the belief that under statehood that leadership would throw its weight upon the side of social and economic justice to the masses of the people of Hawaii?

Mr. FARRINGTON. You mean the leadership in management?

The CHAIRMAN. That is right, the economic leadership.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Oh, I am quite confident of that, Senator. In certain fields we have been far advanced, particularly in the field of racial relationship. It should be pointed out also that our industrialists for years have supported appropriation of adequate funds and heavy taxation to sustain a good system of education. I think you will find from the testimony of men like Mr. Henry White, the president of the Hawaiian Pineapple Co., that their point of view is a very advanced and progressive one.

The CHAIRMAN. I raise that question, Delegate Farrington, because I am convinced that, in the present very delicate international situation, the greatest progress that the people of the United States could make toward bringing peace in the world would be if they could find a way of convincing the inhabitants of the Eastern Hemisphere that under the system of private property, economic freedom and political freedom would go hand in hand to raise the standards of living for the masses of the people and to provide equal economic opportunity.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Senator, Hawaii has been a proving ground of exactly that thing. We are a lighthouse of democracy in the Pacific.

Our peoples are disciples of the American way of life. If you do not believe that, I invite you to go down through the islands of the south and central Pacific as I did with Congressman Crawford and a com-

mittee this fall. You will find that all the way through the Pacific, Honolulu is to those people what Washington is to all Americans, what London is to the British, what Paris is to the French. That same influence manifests itself through the Far East.

You will find our boys are leaders in the fight for democracy. Where do the churches who want to advance their work in the Pacific islands, in the Far East, look for missionaries? They look to Hawaii, because in Hawaii the boys and girls have been trained in this philosophy of life—trained to impart to people who they know and who they have been a part of, the facts and spirits of the American way of life.

The CHAIRMAN. You desire former Delegate King to take the stand now?

Mr. FARRINGTON. No. I am going to call on the congressional witnesses first. Mr. King will open for the Hawaiian witnesses. We will hear the congressional witnesses first.

The CHAIRMAN. Very good. Senator Kefauver.

STATEMENT OF HON. ESTES KEFAUVER, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

Senator KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee. It was my privilege to introduce in the Eighty-first Congress S. 1782, a companion bill to S. 156 which was introduced jointly by my colleagues Senator Knowland, of California, and Senator Cordon, of Oregon.

I should first identify myself. I am the junior Senator, very junior, from the State of Tennessee. Ever since I came to the House of Representatives in 1939, I have been very much interested in the desire of the people of Hawaii for statehood. I have been much impressed with the case that they have made for statehood.

I have also been highly impressed with the character of representation the Hawaiian people have sent to the Congress and to other legislative hearings and bodies that have been studying this problem.

When I first came to the House of Representatives I became acquainted with the then Delegate, Capt. Sam King, and through him I learned much about the conditions in Hawaii and became convinced then that the time had come that they should be granted statehood. Then, in 1942, I believe it was, when Mr. Farrington succeeded Captain King, I joined Mr. Farrington in this effort.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I have known Governor Stainback for many years. Governor Stainback, I believe, became Governor of Hawaii 8 years ago. He is a conservative, intelligent, thoughtful man of a pioneer Tennessee family, and I know that if Governor Stainback as well as all the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives who are supporting this cause—I see Congressman Peterson, Congressman Crawford, and Congressman Larcade here today—I know if there was any real question about communism or any condition in Hawaii not entitling the Hawaiian people to statehood that they would be the first to speak out and the first to oppose statehood.

It is my considered opinion, Mr. Chairman, that Hawaii has long been promised statehood both by implication and by official action of the Government of the United States and that the strategic time has come for the Congress to keep that promise.

I know that a number of the members of the committee and the chairman are familiar with the history of the implied promises that have been made, and also these matters I have found have been covered to some extent in the testimony of Governor Stainback and Secretary Chapman, but I do want to go over them briefly. Fifty years ago Hawaii voluntarily surrendered its independence at the urgent invitation of this country. This action between two governments took place in order that Hawaii might be, as officially stated, "incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof." It was understood that the language used and the action taken was an assurance that when Hawaii was able to meet the requirements it would be granted statehood. This action of Congress incorporating Hawaii into the Union was an implied promise of State government for Hawaii.

On a number of occasions, prominent leaders of our Government have also led the people of Hawaii to believe that they would be granted statehood.

In 1854, almost a century ago, President Franklin Pierce authorized negotiations to annex Hawaii to the United States. The treaty of 1854, as proposed, stated that the "Hawaiian Islands shall be incorporated into the American Union as a State, enjoying the same degree of sovereignty as other States, and admitted as such as soon as it can be done in consistency with the principles and requirements of the Federal Constitution, to all the rights, privileges, and immunity of a State as aforesaid on a perfect equality with other States of the Union." Though the treaty was not ratified, the discussions in official circles of making Hawaii a State caused the people of Hawaii to believe statehood was their destiny.

President Andrew Johnson, in his annual message to the Fortieth Congress on December 19, 1868, in speaking of a reciprocity treaty with Hawaii, said, "It would be a guaranty of the good will and forbearance of all nations until the people of the islands shall of themselves, at no distant day, voluntarily apply for admission into the Union." Twenty-two years later, Hawaii was incorporated into the Union. Since then, Hawaii has petitioned Congress for statehood on 16 different occasions.

Our own President, Harry S. Truman, as long ago as January 21, 1946, recommended statehood for Hawaii in his annual message on the state of the Union. He has publicly repeated his recommendation again and again, including statehood for Hawaii in his message to Congress when we reconvened this year.

When the elected leaders of our American democracy throughout nearly a hundred-year period officially recommend that Hawaii should be granted State government, it is time the recommendation be fulfilled.

Congress itself, through utterances of its members and by action of its committees, has caused the people of Hawaii over the years to believe that State government would soon be achieved.

The action taken by Congress is much more than an implied promise—it is the continuation of a policy firmly established by Congress on 29 other occasions when States have been brought from territoriality to statehood.

It has been recognized historically that when Congress actively recognizes a Territory as a "part of the United States," and incorpo-

rates it into the Union as such, that in itself is a prerequisite to any step in the direction of statehood.

As long ago as 1900, Congress rejected an amendment to the proposed Organic Act for Hawaii which would have provided that Hawaii should not at any time in the future be admitted to statehood. It was during the Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, that Congressman Ebenezer J. Hill, Republican, of Connecticut, during debates on the proposed Organic Act for Hawaii, moved to add an amendment as follows:

Nothing in this Act shall be construed, taken, or held to imply a pledge or promise that the Territory of Hawaii will at any future time be admitted as a State or attached to any State.

When questioned by a colleague, Congressman Joseph G. Cannon of Illinois, as to whether or not there was anything in the bill providing a government for Hawaii which committed Congress to admit Hawaii to statehood, Congressman Hill replied,

I think there is, * * * The American people look upon the authorization and full organization of a Territory as the first step toward statehood. It has always been so construed; it always will be so construed.

The amendment was rejected. But Congressman Hill was correct when he stated:

The American people look upon the authorization and organization of a Territory as the first step toward statehood.

Senator Morgan of Alabama, during debate on Hawaii's Organic Act in the Senate on February 20, 1900, said that when he was in Hawaii as a member of the Commission appointed by President McKinley to draft a form of government for Hawaii, he had made a study of Hawaii's experiences in government.

Following his two visits to Hawaii, he said, "I became satisfied that those people had built up a government that was at least equal in all respects to any government in the American Union." This utterance was made 50 years ago. He then told the United States Senate his first proposition to the members of the Commission meeting in Honolulu was that "we should recommend that the people of the Hawaiian Islands should hold a convention, adopt a Constitution and apply for admission into the American Union."

A member of the historical group who, in 1900, drafted Hawaii's Organic Act, Justice Walter Frear, wrote to Hawaii's Delegate to Congress, the Honorable Joseph R. Farrington, that the five-man Commission "did recognize and realize at the time that they were recommending for Hawaii a status which was regarded at the time as leading to statehood."

During the past 15 years Congress has, on a number of occasions, sent its committees to Hawaii to investigate the readiness of Hawaii to attain statehood. Several of these congressional committees have also held statehood hearings in our National Capital. Every year since the end of the war, a congressional committee has recommended immediate statehood for Hawaii. It is no wonder the half-million people of Hawaii feel that statehood has been promised to them. Yet the nearest to actual attainment of their goal came in 1947—after 27 years of effort—when the House of Representatives first passed a statehood bill for Hawaii, and then followed by the passage of a bill in this Congress.

From every historical precedent in our dealing with former territories which are now States, the people of Hawaii have had every reason to believe that they would one day attain State government. Statehood for Hawaii has been promised by implication ever since our Nation began to function.

The Continental Congress provided in the Ordinance of 1787 for the admission of States. In those days when a territory had 5,000 free male inhabitants, it was granted legislative powers and allowed to have a Delegate to Congress; when it had 60,000 inhabitants it was eligible for statehood. Hawaii, today, has a half-million inhabitants—more than any of the other 29 territories had when they attained statehood, excepting only Oklahoma. Yet Hawaii, which has served an apprenticeship of half a century, in contrast to the average of 20 years for all other former territories now States, still lives on in hopes of having the promises of statehood fulfilled.

The promises of statehood have not only been held out to Hawaii by action of our Government, and by statements of our Presidents, but by the two major political parties of the United States. It is repetitious but both the Democratic and Republican Parties endorse statehood for Hawaii. Ten years ago the Democratic Party platform announced it favored a larger measure of self-government leading to statehood for Hawaii. In 1944, the Republican Party said that—

Hawaii * * * is entitled to the fullest measure of home rule looking toward statehood—

in this same year the Democratic Party endorsed “eventual statehood for Hawaii.”

Two years ago the Republican platform supported “eventual statehood for Hawaii,” while the Democratic Party urged “immediate statehood for Hawaii.” These promises to the people of Hawaii must be kept. We must give increasing evidence to the teeming millions of people the world over that democracy works.

The United States Congress has a direct obligation to the citizens of Hawaii to grant them statehood. Hawaii was annexed by act of Congress nearly 52 years ago as a “part of the territory of the United States.” Congress, in 1900, by enactment of an Organic Act—in reality a pattern of a State constitution—completed the incorporation of Hawaii as an integral part of the Union. Based on historical precedent, Hawaii has been promised statehood.

Our Supreme Court recognizes the ephemeral character of Territorial status. The Court in one case before it concluded that—

* * * the organization of governments for the Territories was but temporary, and would be superseded when the Territories became States of the Union.

The three branches of Government under our Constitution have by their actions implied or promised State government to Hawaii: Congress has already enacted legislation to admit as States 29 former Territories; a number of our executives, including President Truman and the Secretary of the Interior, have endorsed State government for Hawaii; Supreme Court decisions have pointed out that Territorial government was necessarily limited to a period of pupillage before they become States of the Union.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that we should keep our promises to the people of the Territory of Hawaii that with maturity will come responsibility. In this modern world of ours, Hawaii needs voting representation in Congress. Let us not act contrary to American prin-

ciples of democracy. "No taxation without representation" and "No government without the consent of the governed," are axioms as much alive and as important to the people of Hawaii as they were to our forefathers who first conceived them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know that Senator Knowland and other witnesses have much to say about the effect upon our foreign policy of this action. I personally think that with our situation in the Pacific, with our effort as you stated a few minutes ago to convince people everywhere that democracy is an expanding thing: a form of government that people want and we hope that free people will attain; that this action is not only something the people of Hawaii are entitled to but would do more to help us in our relations with people in the rest of the world, particularly in the Far East and the Pacific, than anything we can do. I feel very strongly and have a deep conviction, that this Senate this session would be missing a great opportunity to take a great move toward strengthening our foreign policy in the interest of democracy, if we did not act upon this bill at this time favorably.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions?

Senator Butler?

Senator BUTLER. Senator, you spoke about taxation without representation and the situation in the Pacific, each of which would be taken care of if Hawaii were given statehood. Do you not think that the answer to those two questions would be made just as well if Hawaii were made a part of California or Oregon or Washington on the west coast?

Senator KEFAUVER. No, sir; I certainly do not, Senator. I think, on the basis of the economy of Hawaii, that they are entitled to statehood. It is a separate State toward which they have been working.

Senator BUTLER. My question does not deal with the question of whether they are entitled to it or not. I just wanted you to answer the question, if it does not take care of those two points, if they can become a part of another State.

Senator KEFAUVER. I think the feeling of the people in the Pacific Islands and the Far East, if Hawaii were made a part of Oregon or California, or whatnot, would frankly be worse than if we just left it in its present status.

Senator BUTLER. We have many very prominent citizens in my own State who came from Japan, of Japanese origin.

Senator KEFAUVER. Yes, sir.

Senator BUTLER. You find them in professions, you find them in business, you find them especially in agriculture, and they are all leaders. They have not asked me in Nebraska to admit Japan as a part of the United States territory in order to show my feeling toward the oriental situation, and I believe that they would be perfectly satisfied, if they have any desire along that line, if Hawaii were made a part of some other State.

Senator KEFAUVER. Well, Senator, the Japanese situation is not comparable at all. Of course, our relationship with Japan has been very different than with Hawaii.

I think the people of the Far East and the Pacific who have an interest in democracy would be very much let down. They would have the feeling that the United States Senate did not have enough confidence in the Hawaiian people to feel that they could sustain state-

hood on their own, and had to be incorporated into another State, and that the effect would be just the opposite of what we are trying to accomplish. That is my opinion.

Senator LEHMAN. Is it not a fact too, Senator, that it would be entirely impracticable for a State to administer a Territory?

Senator KEFAUVER. I would think so.

Senator LEHMAN. I can say from my own experience as Governor of New York that, while we favored the admission of Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Arizona, Oklahoma and these territories, we certainly never would have suggested or thought it was practicable to govern those territories from New York State or from any other State in the Union. No State would have the machinery to do it, while the Federal Government has.

Senator KEFAUVER. I think that is a point very well taken. It would be impossible, I think, from an administrative viewpoint; and furthermore the Hawaiian Islands are an integral unit of their own, and they have very different problems from California or Oregon.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, indeed, Senator Kefauver.

Delegate Farrington, I believe Congressman Peterson will be your next witness.

STATEMENT OF HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I will make my statement very brief. I do not want to be in the position of a friend of the legislation and actually take a lot of time filibustering against it.

I was one of those who originally had some sort of an ingrained prejudice against going out of the continental United States. As a school child, I used to make these speeches: "Nature has fixed the boundaries of this glorious Republic of ours," quoting from some Senator. That is in the Congressional Record way back.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a little difficult to know whether you regard that as a compliment or not.

Mr. PETERSON. That was my general feeling. Then when I became a member of the Public Lands Committee, I started going into the testimony. I wanted to be fair and I wanted to be thorough, and as I went along and analyzed the whole situation based on the history and on the facts and on the accomplishments, I determined that Hawaii was entitled to statehood. I think, by reason of the fact that I had had the other feeling, and based on the series of long hearings which I studied, I became thoroughly convinced first that by reason of the peculiar method by which Hawaii came under the American flag, the utterances made over that period of time, it was the hope and implied assurance that ultimately she would become a State.

Then I analyzed and have prepared and wish, if you have no objection, to place in the record, as I think it might be of interest, a table showing the area and population of each of the other Territories as they came into statehood. I received it too late to put it into our House committee hearings, but I have the data of the Original Thirteen States which I think it might be well to place in the record. The second chart shows the population of the various Territories as they came into Statehood.

The CHAIRMAN. The material will be received and made a part of the record.

(The documents above referred to follow:)

Ratifications of the Constitution by the Thirteen Original States, their population and area

State	Date of ratification of the Constitution	Population at date of ratification	Population in 1930	Population in 1940	Area in square miles
Delaware.....	Dec. 7, 1787	59,069	238,380	266,505	2,050
Pennsylvania.....	Dec. 12, 1787	434,373	9,613,350	9,900,180	45,215
New Jersey.....	Dec. 19, 1787	184,139	4,041,334	4,160,165	7,815
Georgia.....	Jan. 2, 1788	82,548	2,908,506	3,123,723	59,475
Connecticut.....	Jan. 9, 1788	238,141	1,606,903	1,709,242	4,990
Massachusetts.....	Feb. 6, 1788	378,787	4,249,614	4,316,721	8,315
Maryland.....	Apr. 28, 1788	319,728	1,631,536	1,821,244	12,210
South Carolina.....	May 23, 1788	249,073	1,738,765	1,899,804	30,570
New Hampshire.....	June 21, 1788	141,899	465,293	491,524	9,305
Virginia.....	June 25, 1788	747,610	2,421,851	2,677,773	42,450
New York.....	July 26, 1788	340,120	12,588,066	13,479,142	49,170
North Carolina.....	Nov. 21, 1789	393,751	3,170,276	3,571,623	52,250
Rhode Island.....	May 29, 1790	68,825	687,497	713,346	1,250

REMARKS

Georgia: Seceded Jan. 19, 1861. Readmitted to representation by the act of July 15, 1870.

South Carolina: Seceded Dec. 20, 1860. Readmitted to representation upon ratifying the fourteenth amendment, July 9, 1868.

Virginia: The area of Virginia at the date of ratification was 61,352 square miles, but Dec. 31, 1862, a portion of its territory was set off and admitted into the Union as a free and independent State under the name of West Virginia. The State seceded Apr. 17, 1861, and readmitted by act of Jan. 26, 1870.

North Carolina: Seceded May 21, 1861. Readmitted to representation upon ratifying the fourteenth amendment, July 4, 1868.

States admitted into the Union since the adoption of the Constitution, their population and area

State	Date of admission	Population at time of admission	Population in 1930	Population in 1940	Area in square miles
Vermont.....	Feb. 18, 1791	85,539	359,611	359,231	9,565
Kentucky.....	June 1, 1792	73,677	2,614,589	2,845,627	40,400
Tennessee.....	June 1, 1796	77,262	2,616,556	2,915,841	42,040
Ohio.....	Nov. 29, 1802	41,915	6,646,697	6,907,612	41,060
Louisiana.....	Apr. 30, 1812	75,556	2,101,593	2,363,880	48,720
Indiana.....	Dec. 11, 1816	63,897	2,238,503	3,472,796	36,350
Mississippi.....	Dec. 10, 1817	75,512	2,009,821	2,183,796	46,810
Illinois.....	Dec. 3, 1818	34,620	7,630,654	7,897,241	56,650
Alabama.....	Dec. 14, 1819	144,317	2,646,248	2,832,961	52,250
Maine.....	Mar. 15, 1820	298,335	797,423	847,226	33,040
Missouri.....	Aug. 10, 1821	66,585	3,629,367	3,784,665	69,415
Arkansas.....	June 15, 1836	552,240	1,854,482	1,949,387	53,850
Michigan.....	Jan. 26, 1837	120,000	4,842,325	5,256,106	58,915
Florida.....	Mar. 3, 1845	54,477	1,468,211	1,897,414	58,680
Texas.....	Dec. 29, 1845	1250,000	5,824,715	6,414,824	265,780
Iowa.....	Dec. 28, 1846	81,920	2,470,939	2,538,268	56,025
Wisconsin.....	May 29, 1848	210,596	2,939,006	3,137,587	56,040
California.....	Sept. 9, 1850	107,000	5,677,251	6,907,387	158,360
Minnesota.....	May 11, 1858	150,042	2,563,953	2,792,300	83,365
Oregon.....	Feb. 14, 1859	52,465	953,786	1,098,684	96,030
Kansas.....	Jan. 29, 1861	107,206	1,850,999	1,801,028	82,080
West Virginia.....	June 19, 1863	376,683	1,729,205	1,901,974	24,780
Nevada.....	Oct. 31, 1864	140,000	91,058	110,247	110,700
Nebraska.....	Mar. 1, 1867	160,000	1,377,963	1,315,834	77,510
Colorado.....	Aug. 1, 1876	150,000	1,035,791	1,123,296	103,925
South Dakota.....	Nov. 2, 1889	1400,000	692,849	642,916	77,650
North Dakota.....			680,845	641,935	70,795
Montana.....	Nov. 8, 1889	112,000	537,456	559,456	146,080
Washington.....	Nov. 11, 1889	1273,000	1,563,396	1,736,191	69,180
Idaho.....	July 3, 1890	84,385	445,030	524,873	84,000
Wyoming.....	July 10, 1890	60,705	225,565	250,742	97,890
Utah.....	Jan. 4, 1896	241,000	507,847	550,310	84,970
Oklahoma.....	Nov. 16, 1907	-----	2,396,040	2,336,434	70,057
New Mexico.....	Jan. 6, 1912	-----	423,317	531,818	122,580
Arizona.....	Feb. 14, 1912	-----	435,573	499,261	113,020

¹ Estimated.

The territories:¹ Date of the establishment of a territorial government in each, the population and area

Territory	Date of establishment of Territorial government	Population in 1930	Population in 1940	Area in square miles
Alaska.....	May 17, 1884	59,278	72,524	590,884
District of Columbia ²		486,869	663,091	70
Hawaii.....	June 14, 1900	368,336	423,330	6,449

¹ Includes the District of Columbia.

² District of Columbia established under art. 1, sec. 8, clause 17 of Constitution. Territory originally ceded by Maryland (legislative act of Dec. 23, 1788) and Virginia (legislative act of Dec. 3, 1789); cessions accepted by Congress by act of July 16, 1790, lines and bounds established by proclamation of President Washington, Mar. 30, 1791. Virginia's cession retraced by act of Congress July 9, 1846. Governed by board of 3 commissioners appointed by the President (act of June 20, 1874).

Mr. PETERSON. We had in the House the problem which was outlined by Delegate Farrington. There was the fear on the part of some that this might be a model and we would be taking in other offshore areas as States. There were those who might object to offshore areas, and analyzing the situation we found this: that Alaska and Hawaii were the last two incorporated Territories. We found in our own opinion that incorporating Territories by the United States was virtually a probationary period toward statehood.

It is my feeling that Hawaii has served that probationship and is entitled to statehood.

I have a short prepared statement which in the interest of time I will not attempt to read, but will offer for the record.

In that I include the findings of the Larcade committee which made a rather extensive study. It gives facts with reference to the population of each race there, increase in certain races, the economic trend, the number of farms, the amount of revenue raised over a period of years.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be received.

(The prepared statement of Congressman Peterson follows:)

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the committee, the Committee on Public lands reported the bill favorably after a number of subcommittee hearings and the record will show a series of hearings over the years developing a large amount of factual data. Alaska and Hawaii are the last of the incorporated Territories. Shortly after the purchase of Alaska, Secretary Seward referred to the time when Alaska would become a member of the sisterhood of States. When Hawaii came under the flag of the United States, she had already established her existence as an independent republic. Later, Hawaii was established as an incorporated Territory of the United States and for half a century has virtually been on probation. Today its economic affairs are in good shape and its population is far in excess of a large number of Territories that acquired statehood.

I invite particular attention to the findings of the subcommittee of the former Committee on Territories, in 1946, which appear on pages 64 to 70 of the House hearings, which I include herewith:

FINDINGS

On the basis of this detailed and voluminous record the committee finds—

1. That the population of the Territory of Hawaii in 1945 was 502,122. Ethnically, the population consists of 10,988 Hawaiians, or 2.2 percent of the total population; part-Hawaiians, 61,422, or 12.2 percent; Puerto Ricans, 9,090, or 1.8 percent; Caucasians, 172,583, or 34.4 percent; Chinese 30,005, or 6 percent, Japanese, 163,300, or 32.5 percent; Koreans, 7,042 or 1.4 percent; Filipinos, 46,464, or 9.3 percent; all others, 1,228, or 0.2 percent.

2. That the Hawaiians have declined from an estimated 300,000 persons in 1778 to 10,988 in 1945.

3. That the Caucasian population has increased steadily since 1878, when the percentage of the total population was 5.09 percent.

4. That persons of Japanese ancestry in 1890 numbered 12,360, or 13.7 percent of the total population. By 1920 it increased to 42.7 percent, declined to 37.9 percent in 1930, and to date is placed at 32.5 percent, numbering 163,300 persons.

5. That since 1912 the proportion of interracial marriages has increased from 14.1 to 38.5 percent—the recent war has accentuated this trend. During the war years over one-third of the children born had two or more racial strains.

6. That well over 85 percent of the present population were born in Hawaii or on the mainland.

7. That the war record of Hawaii is in every respect commendable. Hawaii had a full-scale organization for civilian defense and volunteer defense units sponsored by the Army, as well as participating in the usual Red Cross, USO blood bank, and similar activities, making liberal contributions to the war chest and oversubscribing for war bonds. The Territory established a number of emergency agencies, such as a bureau of registration and identification, office of food control and food production, and a commercial rent-control program.

8. That Hawaii did its part in contributing men to the Armed Forces. Selective service did not apply to Hawaii during the first 2 years of the war, because of the Territory's crucial position and shortage of manpower. Since the application of the draft Hawaii has met its full quota.

Hawaii had two National Guard regiments, which were called into the Federal service on October 15, 1940. In all, 33,000 of the citizens of Hawaii served in the Armed Forces. Although Americans of Japanese ancestry constituted only 36 percent of the registrants under selective service, 52 percent of the total inductions from December 1940 to September 1945 came from this racial group, because of the large numbers of volunteers. Because of the Army policy of organizing and segregating units composed of citizens of Japanese ancestry, it is possible to follow their activities and to compare their record with the distrust initially shown by the military commanders. Hawaii residents of Japanese ancestry constituted the entire original One Hundredth Infantry Battalion and by far the major part of the original Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team. The record of those units, made in major offensives in the European theater, includes 5 Presidential unit citations, 1 meritorious-service plaque, 65 Distinguished Service Crosses, 290 Silver Stars, 782 Bronze Stars, 10 Croix de Guerre (French), 3 soldiers' medals (Italian), 50 Army commendations, and 82 division commendations.

9. That according to Robert L. Shivers, Federal Bureau of Investigation agent in charge at Honolulu, there was not one single act of sabotage or fifth-column activity committed in Hawaii before, during, or after the attack on Pearl Harbor. Hawaii's people of various racial ancestries can and do work together. What goes on in the countries of their ancestors is of minor concern to them compared to their interest in the United States. People of all racial ancestries cooperated in preparing for and prosecuting the war, and Hawaii, despite its polyracial composition, is essentially American in thought, purpose, and action.

10. That the people of the Territory of Hawaii are a law-abiding people. Its different racial groups live together with a minimum of friction and no racial clashes; life and property are as safe in Hawaii as in any section of the mainland.

11. That such evidence of "bloc voting" as exists indicates that the practice has not assumed, and is not likely to assume, serious proportions. Members of the Territorial Legislature whose ancestry is Japanese constitute normally less than 20 percent of the total membership, although 32.5 percent of the total population of the islands is of Japanese descent.

12. That in 1944, 71,704 of 84,326 registrants, or 85.03 percent, voted in the general election. The percentage of registered votes of Hawaiian ancestry declined from 33.8 percent in 1932 to 24.7 percent in 1940; Caucasian votes declined from 38.2 percent in 1932 to 30.1 percent in 1940. The Japanese showed an increase from 17.6 to 31.1 percent. With few exceptions, the percentage of registrants voting in each general election ranged between 85 to 90 percent.

13. That of the Territory's 4,118,400 acres, 1,762,050 acres, or 42.78 percent, is in public ownership and 2,356,350 acres, of 57.22 percent, are privately owned. The largest single owner has 8.87 percent of the total of privately owned lands, and the 10 largest owners (including the largest owner) together hold 30.11 percent; the 50 largest owners (including the 10 largest owners) hold 39.55 percent, and all other owners hold 17.67 percent of all privately owned land.

14. That the largest owner is the B. P. Bishop estate, holding approximately 370,000 acres. This is a charitable trust, founded by a Hawaiian princess for the support of the Kamehameha schools, which are devoted to the education of Hawaiians and part Hawaiians and the expenses of administering the trust are paid from trust funds.

15. That of the Territory's total 4,118,400 acres, 2,947,330 acres are devoted as follows: 1,045,085 acres are devoted to forest reserves; 164,205 acres to national parks; 84,040 acres to Army, Navy, or other public use (including Territorial and county purposes but not including highways); 1,350,000 acres to pasturage; 220,000 acres to the growing of sugarcane; 63,000 acres to the growing of pineapples; and approximately 21,000 acres to the growing of other crops, including 6,760 acres, truck farming; 4,000 acres, coffee; 2,090 acres, fruits; 2,067 acres, taro and field crops; 770 acres, macadamia nuts; and 5,438 acres for miscellaneous crops.

16. That in 1940 there were 2,094 farms of less than 5 acres, and 4,724 farms of less than 100 acres (including those less than 5 acres).

17. That in 1944 Hawaii produced 874,946 tons of sugarcane, the crop being valued at \$65,498,535.

18. That in 1940 (the latest year for which complete figures are available) Hawaii produced 22,341,429 cases of pineapple valued at \$45,851,706.

19. That the coffee production of the islands in 1944 totaled 7,656,000 pounds, valued at \$1,091,000.

20. That the Territory has consistently paid into the United States Treasury a considerably larger amount than the Federal Government, exclusive of military expenditures, has spent upon the Territory.

21. That in 1944 and 1945 Hawaii exceeded several States in the total of its internal-revenue collections. In 1945 Hawaii paid into the Federal Treasury \$173,999,227.22.

22. That the finances of the Territory have been very well managed. At the end of last biennium on June 30, 1945, total budgetary resources of the Territory amounted to \$68,339,384, with total obligations and reserves in the amount of \$57,873,691, leaving an unappropriated surplus of \$10,465,693. The bonded debt of the Territory as of December 31, 1945, was \$16,520,000, with \$7,151,344 in the sinking fund, leaving a net amount of \$9,368,656.

23. That during the calendar year 1945, the following tax revenues were produced from the following sources:

Real property-----	\$6, 568, 605. 43
Personal property-----	3, 697, 620. 65
Income: Personal and corporation-----	3, 529, 447. 21
Public utility-----	1, 897, 497. 05
Liquid fuel-----	1, 932, 749. 57
Compensation and dividend-----	8, 819, 507. 92
Bank excise-----	50, 000. 00
Liquor-----	1, 908, 979. 50
Tobacco-----	422, 664. 86
Gross income and consumption-----	10, 460, 310. 25
Unemployment compensation-----	1, 888, 749. 18
Business excise, poll, public welfare (prior years)-----	96, 468. 83
Administered by tax commissioner-----	41, 272, 600. 45
Inheritance and estate-----	661, 274. 16
Insurance-----	451. 472. 58
Miscellaneous licenses-----	10, 252. 63
Administered by Territorial treasurer-----	1, 122, 999. 37
Total-----	42, 395, 499. 82

24. That there are 35 sugar companies operating in the Territory with a total capitalization of approximately \$175,000,000, and with stock held by approximately 16,000 persons. That there are five corporations, known as the Big Five, which act in the capacity of factors or agents for practically all of these plantations, and to some extent have substantial stockholdings in the plantation companies. The companies, with the number of plantations represented and the

approximate percentage of sugar production for each group of plantations, are as follows:

	Number of plantations represented	Approximate percentage of total sugar production
American Factors, Ltd.	9	30.8
C. Brewer & Co., Ltd.	14	23.5
Alexander & Baldwin	4	20.8
Castle & Cooke, Ltd.	3	14.5
Theodore H. Davies, Ltd.	4	6.9
Total	34	96.5

The agency system is not used to such a predominant extent in the pineapple industry, although some of the Big Five are connected with that industry through stock ownership or other affiliation. The Big Five has other interests as well.

25. That the commerce of Hawaii with the continental United States exceeds that between the mainland and all but a few foreign countries. From 1935 to 1940 only five foreign countries—the United Kingdom, Canada, Japan, France, and Germany—bought more from the mainland than did Hawaii. In 1940 the value of the Territory's imports from the mainland totaled \$127,539,539, while the value of exports to the mainland was \$102,145,130.

26. That bank deposits have increased from \$4,662,131 in 1901 to \$493,295,940 in 1945, a good deal of the increase in later years being due, of course, to military and naval operations in the area.

27. That Hawaii's gross assessed value of real property is over \$500,000,000, higher than that of any State at the time of admission with the exception of Oklahoma.

28. That as of December 1945, 36,875 corporations, firms, or individuals were engaged in 54,412 different enterprises as employers or self-employers.

(a) There were 12,918 persons or companies engaged in retailing, representing the following businesses:

Appliances	66	General merchandise	1,135
Auto dealers	42	Groceries	641
Auto supplies	69	Hardware	61
Bakeries	61	Household products	15
Barrooms and saloons	380	Jewelers	185
Books and stationery	34	Liquor stores	173
Building materials	10	Lumber	10
Chemicals	17	Meat dealers and meat markets	333
Cold drinks	206	Mill supplies	11
Confectionery	205	Music stores and composers	23
Curios and novelties	298	Newspapers	25
Department stores	12	Nurseries	88
Drugs	151	Office equipment and supplies	27
Dry goods	222	Optical	17
Electric supplies	21	Poultry	636
Equipment	43	Radio and radio supplies	67
Fish dealers and fish markets	532	Restaurants	952
Food products	481	Service stations	387
Fountains and lunchrooms	444	Shoe stores	68
Fruit and vegetable	713	Toilet articles and cosmetics	55
Furniture	91	Wearing apparel	172

(b) There were 2,999 companies or persons engaged in wholesaling, including the following types of wholesaling:

Appliances	14	Building materials	7
Auto dealers	14	Coconuts	9
Auto parts	36	Confectioneries	23
Bakeries	55	Curios and novelties	137
Beverages	11	Drugs	39
Block printing	19	Dry goods	42
Boatbuilding	10	Electrical appliances	19
Bottle dealers	21	Equipment	16

Feed-----	6	Junk dealers-----	8
Fish dealers-----	273	Lauhala weaving-----	166
Florists-----	41	Leis-----	19
Food products-----	109	Lumber-----	5
Fruit and vegetable dealers-----	280	Magazines-----	7
Furniture-----	26	Meats-----	56
General merchandise-----	264	Music-----	9
Groceries-----	44	Tobacco-----	6
Hardware-----	12	Toilet articles and cosmetics-----	11
Household products-----	5	Toys-----	10
Jewelers-----	70	Wearing apparel-----	32

(c) Eight thousand three hundred and fifty-eight companies or persons were engaged in producing raw products, including—

Dairies-----	66	Hog raisers-----	589
Farming-----	1, 051	Poultry producers-----	811
Fishing-----	350	Sugar growers-----	2, 135
Flower growers-----	214	Vegetables and fruits-----	1, 542

(d) One thousand four hundred and twenty-six persons or companies were engaged in manufacturing, including—

Alcoholic beverages-----	12	Foods-----	137
Bakery products-----	86	Footwear-----	21
Block printing-----	17	Furniture-----	35
Chemical and fertilizer-----	30	Jewelry-----	16
Clothing-----	27	Mattresses and springs-----	12
Concrete, lime, and stone products-----	11	Nonalcoholic beverages-----	38
Confectionery-----	20	Soap-----	7
Curios and novelties-----	80	Wood products-----	37

29. That out of a total of 170,000 employees (not including part-time work by school children under the schools' temporary program to meet the manpower shortage) the sugar industry employs about 24,500 workers. Pineapple agricultural labor (not including the canneries) is about 4,750; 11,300 are employed in manufacturing (excluding sugar); 10,700 in transportation, communication, and other utility services; 23,000 in wholesale and retail trades; 13,500 in various service industries; 7,400 in diversified agriculture; 6,600 in construction and quarrying; and 3,000 in financial, insurance, and real-estate establishments; 59,500 are in Government service and 4,075 in domestic service.

30. That since 1937, the Territorial legislature passed a number of labor laws, creating the department of labor and industrial relations, and dealing with such matters as apprenticeship, child labor, vocational training, vocational rehabilitation, unemployment compensation, regulation of employment agencies, minimum wages and maximum hours, payment and collection of wages, workmen's compensation and safety regulations.

31. That the Territory's department of labor is considered by the local representative of the Federal Labor Department as doing an able job, and the Territory's labor legislation as comparing very favorably with that of many progressive States, and in some respects is in advance thereof.

32. That the average cash wage paid to sugar employees in 1945 is in excess of \$5 per day for unskilled labor, not including the value of perquisites, which include housing, fuel, water, lights, and medical and hospital services. The cash wage paid in the pineapple industry is comparable. Wages paid industrial workers have advanced in Hawaii more than on the mainland during the period 1940-45 and Hawaii now is on a par with the mainland.

33. That a standard 8-hour day is in effect throughout the Territory.

34. That Hawaii is the only Territory or State with the exception of Wisconsin to pass a "little Wagner Act" extending collective bargaining to agricultural labor.

35. That unionization of labor has made strides during the past 10 years both in industry and agriculture; nearly all major industries, including the sugar and pineapple industries, are now organized or organization is pending.

36. That there are 46 organizations in the Territory affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, 68 with the CIO, 2 independent unions, and 5 government employees' organizations.

37. That in 1940 there were 7 strikes, involving 502 workers with 33,217 man-days lost; in 1941 there were 16 strikes, involving 2,530 workers, resulting in

34,241 man-days lost; in 1942 there were 2 strikes, involving 49 men, resulting in 67 man-days lost; in 1943 there were 4 strikes, involving 202 workers, resulting in 716 man-days lost; in 1944 there was 1 labor dispute, involving 6 men, with 60 man-days lost; and in 1945, up to November, there had been 9 strikes, involving 1,047 men, with 8,876 man-days lost.

38. That at the last Territorial election a majority of those elected to both houses were endorsed by organized labor.

39. That illiteracy in the islands among native-born citizens is almost non-existent. Hawaii has well equipped schools throughout the Territory, most villages or hamlets being provided with the proper educational facilities.

40. That the standards of instruction, according to the United States Chamber of Commerce, are the same as on the mainland and higher than those in many States. The average number of pupils enrolled per teacher is 27.9 in Hawaii, as compared with 31.4 in the United States urban schools and 26.1 in rural areas. The average pay per teacher in Hawaii is \$2,014 annually, as compared to \$2,013 in urban centers and \$1,018 in rural areas of the mainland.

41. That there is a public library on each of the principal islands. There are 82,435 registered card holders. Each island library owns a bookmobile serving rural schools and homes, and approximately \$620,000 is spent annually on library facilities.

42. That the University of Hawaii compares favorably with many State universities. For the year 1944-45 there were enrolled 1,463 regular students and 145 graduate students. The university had financial support in the amount of \$3,126,028 for the biennium 1943-45, of which Territorial appropriations from general revenues provided 50.8 percent, university income 27.46 percent, and Federal grants 21.74 percent.

43. That the level of the Territory's spiritual and moral life is in the best American tradition.

44. That in 1945 the board of health spent \$1,623,385, or a per capita cost of \$.23 as compared with \$1.66 in 1937.

45. That in 1943 Hawaii's death rates from 18 causes were below the national median. It was higher for syphilis, tuberculosis, and accidents including automobile accidents. The mortality rate of infants under 1 year had declined from 87 per thousand in 1930 to 30 per thousand in 1945; the number of maternal deaths for 1,000 living births had declined from 7 in 1932 to 1.6 in 1945.

46. That the venereal-disease infection rate per 1,000 in Hawaii declined from 175 in 1911 to 7.5 in 1945. On the mainland the rate has declined from 163 in 1911 to approximately 43 in 1945. In Hawaii the locally acquired rate was 1.4 in 1945.

47. That according to the Social Security Board, Hawaii's public-assistance program is based on "liberal progressive legislation." Hawaii has no maximum limitation of public assistance; thus the Territory has placed itself in a position to make payments to needy individuals, commensurate with need, and to give recognition to changes in living costs. Hawaii also has a medical-and-dental-care program, and provides other forms of public assistance for which no Federal grants are given.

48. That in 1945 Hawaii ranked thirty-ninth in the average grant for old-age assistance, fifteenth in the average grant for aid to dependent children, thirty-fifth in average grant for aid to the blind, and fifteenth in the average grant for general assistance.

49. That the Territorial legislature has enacted legislation comparable to that of many States. Hawaii has adopted 20 of the mainland uniform laws. In addition to laws mentioned above, Hawaii has a civil-service law, a modern retirement system for all employees; in the field of public health the Territory enacted the crippled children's act, created the bureau of mental hygiene, passed a uniform narcotic drugs act, established compulsory vaccination for smallpox, typhoid, and other diseases. In addition to the existing public medical-care program the legislature in 1945 provided for a study of health insurance and hospital facilities. In 1935 the legislature created the Hawaii housing authority, passed the Federal Housing Act, authorizing the acquisition by any Federal agency of property suitable for housing projects, and an act entitled "Government Aid for Housing Projects," authorizing the Territory and its political subdivisions to aid in the planning, construction, and operation of housing projects.

Until I went into the matter thoroughly, I had some ingrained thought that we should keep the United States within a compact body and shouldn't go without the continental limits. Rapid changes in world conditions, the study of the records of the past, and analysis of the various hearings caused me to change that

conclusion. It is my strong feeling today that Hawaii has earned its right to statehood, that we should not delay longer her admission into the Union and that both Alaska and Hawaii, the last of the two incorporated Territories now existing, both having served their apprenticeship and probation, so to speak, should be admitted into the Union as States.

Mr. PETERSON (continuing). Then last year I appointed a subcommittee which was headed by former Governor Miles, of New Mexico. Mr. Crawford of Michigan was the ranking Republican member. They came back and made a rather complete report which recommended statehood, and that has been placed in the record by Delegate Farrington.

I feel that Hawaii should be granted statehood. I feel likewise, as I said before, that in the granting of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii we have recognized the probationship of Territories. We are not holding out any particular promise to any other area, because there are no other incorporated Territories.

If any other area came to that point, it would first have to be acted on by Congress under a Territorial status and serve that status before any action could be taken. The real issue is at the time of granting of Territorial status.

That, in the bills which were being drafted, was very carefully preserved in matters relating to the other offshore areas, so as one who has at one time been what you might say is almost a rank isolationist, who had to revise his method of thinking as world conditions changed, and having analyzed a large number of hearings and public utterances by those in authority, I have no hesitancy in urging statehood for Hawaii based upon its population, economic facts, and the progress it has made as a Territory.

I thank you very, very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Chairman Peterson, has anything transpired since the bill was enacted by the House to suggest to your mind any amendment which might have been considered had it been brought up before the House had acted?

Mr. PETERSON. I do not recall in the case of Hawaii. In the case of Alaska, there is a slight amendment by the State Department. There is a communication before your committee on that with reference to the seal, but I do not recall anything with reference to Hawaii that has come up as suggested amendments, unless some detailed amendment is involved, but none has been called to my attention.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you care to make any comment with respect to the problem of the public land owned by the United States, the disposition of such land in Hawaii?

You will recall in the bill as passed by the House that determination of such issue has been postponed for the future.

Mr. PETERSON. That is right. I believe that can be left open to the future with safety. Since they had their constitutional convention, I see no reason why you should not determine that now if you wish, but it is my recollection that that was left open for the future.

The percentage of land owned there is not as high as in many other areas, and is not in my opinion as important a factor as the actual granting of statehood.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions? Thank you very much, Chairman Peterson.

Congressman Crawford.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD, A UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

MR. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of the record I am Fred L. Crawford, Member of Congress, Eighth District of Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege since 1917 to be rather closely affiliated with what I would call the industrial brains or the empire builders or the managers of industry in the Hawaiian Islands. For the fifteen-years plus it has been my privilege to sit on the committee of the House that has to do with Territories and insular affairs.

I want to say at the very beginning that the industrial leaders of Hawaii have from my certain knowledge during the last 33 years been more aggressive and progressive in their so-called social progress than have the industrial leaders of the United States. I have no fear whatsoever about what the industrial leaders, designated as the Big Five or the Big Thirteen or whatever you may want to call them, will do insofar as handling the affairs of that great area is concerned, whether a Territory or a State.

I have no patience whatsoever with those who continually "yap" about what the Big Five or Big Thirteen will do over there. They have human hearts the same as the people in the United States, and they are just as kind to their people. They have a few responsibilities over there with respect to keeping the structure of those islands tied together, so that when a rainy day comes, such as did happen there a few months ago, they still had a little place where people could proceed to obtain a little income.

This progress which we have not made here in the United States with respect to statehood for Hawaii reminds me of a little experience I had down in the British island of Tortuga the last week of this past March. There is a little town there, the capital of the island. They have been approximately 3 years trying to build a little road about six blocks long. We have been some 50 or 75 years talking about statehood for Hawaii, making just about as much progress as the British have made in trying to build those little six blocks of road in that little village down there.

If we are to play fair with our own people under the American flag, if we are to back up in the least degree this philosophy which we are continually spreading all over the world to the so-called little people as set forth in more than a score of international agreements which we have entered into with other nations, then we should put our cards on top of the table and treat the Hawaiian people with some decency. Now that is as about as blunt and frank as I can state that.

Taking every one of these opposition arguments that have been offered, when this first question came up directly before our combined Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, I questioned it from one standpoint only. That was from the standpoint of the communistic influence in Hawaii. The FBI, the Navy Department, the State Department, the Department of the Army, convinced me by direct testimony that there was no reason whatsoever for any fear from that direction, that is no more than from our own cities here in the United States, whether it be Detroit, New York City, Kansas City, Philadelphia, or San Francisco, or any of the other large cities of this

country where bloc voting is effectuated in every general election that is held, and where we have reason to fear the damaging influence of bloc voting more than we have from any of our offshore areas.

I do not believe that anyone can proceed with the argument of the destructive influence of the Communists on the United States insofar as two Senators sitting in this body and one of two Members from the House sitting here might be bloc voting. I do not believe you can sustain the argument that that would be any more destructive than will be the so-called bloc voting of our big city districts here in the United States.

I have much more fear on the so-called bloc voting in these big cities here on the mainland than I do from Hawaii or Alaska, if you want to bring that into the picture. We have the unorganized territories, we have the organized territories.

The gentlemen of Congress here learned in law are familiar with the Supreme Court decisions with respect to the terminology, organized and unorganized. We know that American Samoa does not come within the concept of organized territory. Neither does American Guam, Puerto Rico, nor the Virgin Islands.

We do know that Hawaii and Alaska come within the concept of organized territories. These other areas I have just mentioned are unorganized territories. They are not subject to statehood by any rhyme or reason or argument that might be presented, while on the other hand Hawaii and Alaska are subject to becoming States of the Union.

I have no more objection to bringing in an off-shore area as a State of the Union than I would have in throwing an industrial plant located in the State of Texas into a company with another plant located in the State of Michigan, or vice versa. If it is good business to do it from the standpoint of this general welfare, then why bring up the argument of the off-shore area.

How can we justify such an argument when we go out, as this Congress has gone out, as past Congresses for the past 5 or 6 years have gone out, to every point of the compass, as broad as the earth is, regardless of the argument that is made, we inject ourselves into those governments where we back them with our billions of dollars, where we back them with our substance, back them with the faith and credit of this country as reflected by the general funds of the United States. We apparently seem to think that those people will make good, but we question our own people that have been under our wing for 50 years.

I continually have to answer arguments made to the effect that the Puerto Ricans are no good, that the Virgin Islanders are no good, that the Alaskan people cannot pay the bills of those concepts of government which they themselves create for themselves, that the Hawaiian people cannot carry the responsibilities of statehood.

When we participate in such arguments, such destructive arguments, we argue against the very foundation stones and the ideals and institutions of our own Government.

It is not up to me to say what any man can do, because if I started out on that kind of a program, before I was through saying he could not do it, he would accomplish it beyond my wildest dreams. So it is with people all down through the history of mankind, if you give them the responsibility.

We have the illustration in Puerto Rico right now where the Puerto Rican people are walking away with the cake, you might say, because we put the responsibility on them and said to them "Elect your own Governor and go ahead and do the work as it should be done." They are showing us up in that we were just a little bit too late in doing that. I think we should have given it to them years before. I put the character of the people of Hawaii, against the character of the people in my own State or against the character of the people of any other State in the Union.

The question was raised I believe by Senator Butler with respect to making Hawaii a county or a part of the State of California or some Western State. Of course that would not work out satisfactorily to anybody, and we should know that. It would be impossible of administration, it would be unfair to the two groups of people involved, it would be unfair to the people of the United States.

Every Member of this Congress knows what we are up against insofar as the Pacific and the Far East are concerned. If the next 50 or 100 years is to be the history of the Pacific so far as our participation in world affairs is concerned, how can we avoid making Hawaii the very keystone of whatever structure we may design for the Pacific and the Far East. How can we avoid doing that?

As we traveled through those trustee islands, everywhere we went where Joe Farrington was introduced as the Delegate from Hawaii, there was a new expression on the faces of the people.

You could see the hope light up in their hearts, because, as he pointed out a few moments ago, the people of those far Southwestern Pacific areas look to Hawaii as the gateway to the United States, and whatever philosophy we pass to those people in this forthcoming battle in the Pacific, we have to clear it through the gateway of Hawaii whether we like it or not. There is no way you can jump that area, and the sooner we come to that realization, the better it will be for ourselves as well as for Hawaii.

We need Hawaii as a State much worse than Hawaii needs to be a State of the Union. At least that is my humble opinion about it. As to the details of this bill which the House has approved, you can take any bill and reconsider it and think of one or two or three or more amendments to put into it.

The question was raised about the disposition of the land. So far as I am personally concerned, I would not disturb that at this time if I was going to grant statehood to Hawaii. I would let that come along later, because the land acreage has been substantially fitted into the economy and the living conditions of the people over there. I see no reason why you should disturb that if you are going to give them statehood. Let it be handled after the representatives get here on the ground, sitting in the Senate and the House, and work out the details at that time. Therefore I would not recommend any change in the bill as approved by the House with respect to the public lands.

The constitutional convention which is being held over there, the act which was approved, in my opinion is a step in the right direction. I do not think we should stop now and attempt to force them into a further delayed program with respect to statehood by reason of the fact that they are working on this constitutional program to which they have already given so much attention.

The Territorial status in my opinion can never be satisfactorily operated at any time in the future by reason of the added power that Hawaii has taken on from the standpoint of industrial development, from the standpoint of contributing revenues to the Federal Treasury, and particularly due to the fact that Hawaii is substantially a pivot point for our operations as they relate to the new United States of Indonesia, as they relate to Pakistan in India, as they relate to this baby republic we have in our arms known as the Philippine Republic, as they relate to whatever disposition we are going to make of the Empire of Japan, as they relate to whatever we are to do with the trust islands under the trustee agreement we have made with the United Nations Organization, and finally as they relate to our future relationships with Australia and New Zealand when we well know, Mr. Chairman, that as western Europe moves into decay, the United States must necessarily assume the burden in the far Pacific which has come about through the collapse of the colonial governments that have operated over in that area for so many decades, and which are now out of the picture.

Australia must necessarily directly relate herself to the United States instead of to the British control in London. Australia's and New Zealand's welfare is wrapped up in what we do in the Pacific and the Far East, and that comes directly back again to the status of Hawaii.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sure it is not your intention to imply, Congressman Crawford, by anything you have now said, that the United States must at any time imitate the colonial policies of the European governments which heretofore have been operating in the Far East.

MR. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, there is no way we can possibly do that, if we made the attempt to do it. At the same time if the new Republic of the Philippines and the new United States of Indonesia, with Pakistan, the new relationship of Pakistan and India, internationally speaking, if those new governments are to survive, we know they have to have strength from the United States, very substantial strength, far beyond anything we have put in western Europe, not including the two direct war bills, World War I and World War II.

We know that the resources of this country are being channeled in that direction through the Export-Import Bank. We know as a result of the conference that was held at Ceylon, by reason of all the attention that has been given to that area, that we are as yellow as anybody can be if we step out of the Philippines after spending 50 years there in tutoring them, and we know that the Philippine Republic cannot survive unless we keep our strength completely under that Republic.

Now, if we are going to do that, if we are going to assist Indonesia and those other areas, that pulls us right into the harness with Australia and New Zealand, and the Australian officials have been bold enough to say that very effectively. I do not think there is any secret about that.

That is all the time I want to take of the committee, unless you have some questions to ask, and if you want to ask me any questions about this, you will not embarrass me. I do not care what the questions are. There are no questions barred so far as I am concerned on this particular bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Butler.

Senator BUTLER. No, thanks.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Congressman Crawford. We are obliged to you.
Congressman Larcade.

STATEMENT OF HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR., A UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

MR. LARCADE. My name is Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Representative from the Seventh Congressional District of the State of Louisiana.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before your honorable committee in support of statehood for Hawaii. I would like to say that, as chairman for the subcommittee of the former Committee on Territories of the House of Representatives, I had the honor to be chairman of that subcommittee which made an investigation of this subject in 1946.

The subcommittee visited and held hearings on all of the principal islands of the Hawaiian group, and they heard more than 100 witnesses.

The Congress of the United States has heretofore taken into consideration certain factors in determining the readiness of a Territory for statehood. Among these are the area of the Territory, its population, its economic resources and state of development, and the ability of its people to maintain stable and orderly government.

Three very complete and thorough investigations of Hawaii's readiness for statehood have been made in the past 12 years by our Congress. It is my firm belief and conviction that these investigations show without a doubt that the Territory of Hawaii fully meets and, in most instances, far surpasses the requirements for statehood heretofore exacted of Territories.

The first congressional committee on the Territories to hold hearings in Hawaii on the question of admitting Hawaii to statehood traveled to the islands in October 1935. The six members of the committee visited various parts of the Territory and endeavored to obtain the views of its residents in regard to the question of statehood.

The committee made a thorough investigation and study of all phases of the question of statehood for Hawaii. Exhaustive hearings were held on all of the five principal islands. Two members of the committee remained in Honolulu after the formal hearings had been completed, and made individual research into the subject.

In all, there were 105 witnesses heard; 90 of these witnesses testified in favor of changing from a Territorial status to that of a State.

The committee reported:

The Territory of Hawaii to be a modern unit of the American Commonwealth, with a political, social, and economic structure of the highest type.

Its educational program is an advanced one, with a large proportion of the tax dollar being spent for the training of its youth. Even during the period of the depression this program was neither relaxed nor reduced, and its school facilities compare favorably with those of the most advanced States.

Hawaii's economic standards are high, with an industrial and agricultural development forming a sound basis for the continued growth of the Territory.

Nevertheless the committee concluded that considerable further study was necessary before a favorable report might be made on a proposal to admit Hawaii as a State.

In October 1937, pursuant to a concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives, a joint congressional committee visited the Territory of Hawaii.

Sixty-seven witnesses appeared before the joint committee of 12 in Hawaii. Although the majority of the witnesses favored statehood, and the testimony received by the committee afforded substantial reasons in support of statehood, the report of the committee recommended that the question of statehood because of the disturbed international conditions should again be deferred until further study and consideration could be given.

It was the committee view also "that unmistakable evidence that a substantial majority desire statehood should precede affirmative action by Congress."

The committee indicated that their failure to act affirmatively upon the question of statehood would not prevent further consideration of the subject, particularly after the sentiment of the people of Hawaii had been fully determined.

A plebiscite to determine the wishes of the people of Hawaii was authorized by the legislature of the Territory in 1939. The vote for statehood was in the majority in the ratio of 2 to 1 at the general election in Hawaii in 1940.

The first Gallup poll on statehood held on the mainland in 1941 revealed that opinion in the continental United States for and against statehood for Hawaii was in almost the same proportion as the Territorial view expressed in the plebiscite.

During the war years Congress was not able to give renewed consideration to Hawaii's statehood ambition. But with the end of the war in sight, the duly elected representatives of the people of Hawaii in the Territorial house and senate adopted in 1945, by overwhelming vote in each house, resolutions that the Congress of the United States take immediate action on admitting Hawaii to statehood.

Up to this point, the Legislature of Hawaii had petitioned Congress 14 times for admission to the Union and had made 11 appropriations for congressional investigations of statehood.

It was my assignment and distinct honor to act as the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Territories which investigated statehood for Hawaii in January of 1946. Along with five other Members of Congress, I traveled extensively throughout Hawaii for a period of nearly 2 weeks. Our committee heard more than a hundred witnesses. The testimony heard by the committee amounted to more than 500 printed pages. Statements presented by interested citizens of Hawaii and the exhibits offered in support of the sound operation of the government of Hawaii as a modern American community were compiled and printed, along with the comprehensive testimony taken, for the record.

In all due humility, and with the greatest respect for the untiring efforts of every member of the subcommittee on statehood, I would like to indicate that the data collected by our committee is said to be a most complete and searching record of the Territory of Hawaii, and that it clearly shows the readiness of Hawaii to assume the role of a State.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to present to the committee two copies of our hearings—hearings before the subcommittee

of the Committee on the Territories, House of Representatives, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, pursuant to House Resolution 236, January 1946.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Congressman.

Mr. LARCADE. I would also like to present a copy of the report of the committee which has already been incorporated in the record.

On the basis of the data collected, and our own investigations of Hawaii's readiness for statehood, our committee unanimously recommended in January 1946 that the Committee on the Territories give immediate consideration to legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood.

I am very glad to note that the case for statehood made by our group received further confirmation in the overwhelmingly favorable report of the House Public Lands Committee in March of that year.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the gratifying indication of the completely bipartisan and unanimous support which is being given to the movement for Hawaiian statehood. I also note that not a single person in the entire Nation testified against the bill now before us.

Congressional committees of the House have thoroughly investigated Hawaii's readiness for statehood, and documentary evidence gathered by Congress has proven Hawaii has earned the right to be admitted to the Union as a State.

Hawaii has an area larger than three of our States. Her population at present is larger than the combined total of eight of the States when they were admitted to statehood. Normally, her resources make her our fifth best customer, and she more than pays her own way on the financing of the National Government. Her apprenticeship under American principles of constitutional government for almost 50 years, and the distinctly American pattern of Hawaii's way of life, have eminently fitted the islands for statehood.

Hawaii and its people are entitled to an affirmative vote by this Congress to their petition for acceptance as the forty-ninth State in the Union.

Mr. Chairman, statehood for Hawaii has been approved by the majority of the people of the United States, as indicated by the Gallup poll. Statehood for Hawaii has been almost unanimously endorsed editorially by all of the leading newspapers of the United States, by all of the officials of the Army and Navy, by former Secretary of the Interior Ickes, by former Secretary of the Interior Krug, by present Secretary of the Interior Chapman, and by both political parties of the United States. Both the Democratic and Republican Parties made statehood for Hawaii a part of their platform. Last, but not least, statehood has been endorsed by the present President of the United States, Harry S. Truman.

Hawaii is an integral part of the United States. Its people are as much American citizens as citizens from any other State of the Union. They enjoy the same rights and privileges as any other American citizen. We are responsible for the protection and welfare of the Territory of Hawaii just as we are for any other State.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, Hawaii should be admitted into the Union as the forty-ninth State.

Mr. Chairman, I have read the entire debate in the House and Senate when Hawaii was admitted into the Union as a Territory. Reference thereto will disclose that there was no question but that Hawaii would be granted statehood after being admitted as a Territory. As a

matter of fact, the then distinguished Senator Caffrey, from Louisiana, who opposed the admission of Hawaii into the Union as a Territory, stated that if Hawaii was admitted as a Territory, from the law and precedent quoted in the argument, Hawaii must be admitted into the Union as a State.

At this point I would like to present to the committee the reference to the debate on the Hawaiian annexation resolution and the Hawaiian Organic Act. Any member of the committee can check these references and obtain the entire debate on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a letter from Director Ernest S. Griffith of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. It will appear at the conclusion of your statement.

Mr. LARCADE. The entire debate and argument bears this out. I think that this country and Government assumed this obligation when Hawaii was admitted into the Union as a Territory, and in view of the fact that Hawaii is prepared to assume all of the responsibilities of statehood that Hawaii is now entitled to be admitted to statehood.

Therefore, the issue of whether or not Hawaii should be granted statehood is not the issue. This issue was closed when Hawaii was admitted as a Territory.

The only issue here is whether or not Hawaii will be granted home rule or self-government and be entitled to representation in the Congress of the United States, or—as our forefathers claimed the issue in the American Revolution—whether Hawaii shall have taxation without representation.

Our flag flies over every public building and over the islands of Hawaii. Hawaii is our first line of defense in the Pacific, and this is the only part of the United States that was actually attacked during World War II.

Mr. Chairman, is there any question that Hawaii is part of the United States now?

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I know that many of my distinguished colleagues from the South have asked me why I have given my approval to the admission of Hawaii into the Union because of the racial issue which has been raised in this debate due to the large Caucasian, Asiatic, and Mongolian population of Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman, every Member of this House is aware of my position on this question, as I have stated same here on the floor of the House. I do not think that I am inconsistent in my position in regard to this question in approving the admittance of Hawaii into the Union.

As I have stated here, my people, the South, and myself have definite opinions in regard to the racial question; however, on my visit to Hawaii I observed men and women and children of all races intermingling and assimilating in perfect peace and harmony. If that is their way of life, that is their business, and they are entitled to their way of life.

In the South we do not approve of this way of life, and this should be our business. Like Hawaii, all that we ask is that we be given the same privilege to make our own determination in this respect.

Mr. Chairman, I have no fears for the future of Hawaii. I am of the opinion that when Hawaii is admitted into the Union there will be another shining star added to the constellation in our flag, and that we may depend upon Hawaii exercising the fullest realization of a glorious, patriotic, and peaceful State.

(Letter from Mr. Ernest S. Griffith, Director of Legislative Reference Service, above referred to is as follows:)

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington 25, D. C., April 18, 1950.

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LARCADE: In response to the request of April 17, we submit the legislative action and references to the debate on the Hawaiian annexation resolution and the Hawaiian Organic Act.

House Resolution 259, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session, to provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands (30 Stat. 730) (all page references are to vol. 31 of the Congressional Record):

Introduced by Mr. Newland and referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs, 4600.

Reported back (H. Rept. 1355), 4989.

Made special order, 5765.

Debated and amended, 5770, 5782, 5828, 5872, 5905, 5910, 5967, 5973.

Passed House, 6019.

Referred to Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, 6022.

Reported back, 6062.

Debated, 6140, 6188, 6225, 6229, 6256, 6300, 6326, 6331, 6341, 6350, 6357, 6364, 6409, 6465 6517, 6569, 6582, 6603, 6604, 6605, 6607, 6634, 6660, 6667, 6693.

Passed Senate, 6712.

Examined and signed, 6754, 6785.

Approved by President, 6806.

S. 222, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii (31 Stat. 141) (all page references are to vol. 33 of the Congressional Record):

Introduced by Mr. Cullom and referred to Committee on Foreign Relations, 89, 233.

Reported back with amendment, 643.

Debated and amended, 1559, 1836, 1869, 1918, 1978, 1979, 2022, 2122, 2128, 2179, 2240, 2316, 2386, 2438.

Passed Senate, 2449.

Referred to House Committee on Territories, 2490.

Reported back with amendment (H. Rept. 549), 2637.

Made special order, 2740.

Debated and amended, 3702, 3746, 3769, 3800, 3814, 3857, 3865.

Passed House, 3866.

Laid on table in Senate with House amendment, 3907.

Senate nonconcurrs in House amendment, 3964.

House insists on its amendment, 4072.

Conference appointed, 3965, 4072.

Conference report made, debated, and rejected in Senate, 4357, 4409, 4454, 4508.

Senate further insists on its disagreement to House amendment, 4528.

Second conference appointed, 4508, 4528.

Conference report made, debated, and agreed to, 4648, 4733, 4766,

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director, Legislative Reference Service.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions?

Senator BUTLER. No questions, Mr. Chairman, but I believe the Honorable Congressman would like to correct one statement.

Mr. LARCADE. What is that, sir?

Senator BUTLER. That Hawaii was the only part of the United States area that was attacked during the last world war.

Mr. LARCADE. Yes, I do. The Aleutians were also attacked. Thank you, Senator.

Senator BUTLER. Somebody from Alaska would call you on that if you did not put that in.

Mr. LARCADE. You are quite correct, Senator. I realize that omission and had intended to make the correction in my statement, but overlooked doing so. I thank you for calling it to my attention.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions?

Thank you, indeed, Congressman.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, we had hoped to present at this time Mr. Francis Walter, but he has to be on the floor of the House until 2 o'clock as the Consent Calendar is up.

We would like to present him as the first witness this afternoon if you are meeting this afternoon, and that will just about conclude our national witnesses, and we can go to Mr. King.

The CHAIRMAN. On the list here is Congressman Velde, of Illinois.

Mr. FARRINGTON. He is ill. He will appear later.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Mr. Richardson here?

Mr. FARRINGTON. We will call him later this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. He is not available at the moment?

Mr. FARRINGTON. He is not here now, no.

The CHAIRMAN. So that you would prefer to recess now and call Mr. Walter the first thing this afternoon?

Mr. FARRINGTON. At 2 o'clock, if we may, or such time as you designate. His testimony I think is very important, although I think it will be rather brief. Mr. King will follow him and Mr. Velde's testimony we can bring in later.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be possible to proceed now, unless you prefer to adhere to this order?

Mr. FARRINGTON. We would prefer that.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. Then the committee will stand in recess until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 12:05 p. m., the hearing was recessed to reconvene at 2 p. m., this same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Senator TAYLOR (presiding). The committee will come to order.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Walter is our first witness this afternoon, Mr. Chairman. He was the chairman of the special committee of the House Un-American Activities Committee which conducted an investigation on communism in Hawaii during the month of April. I think he is prepared to testify on the extent of that activity, what the committee discovered, and its relationship to the question before the committee.

Senator TAYLOR. We are happy to have you with us, Mr. Walter.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER, A UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE FROM PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I am Francis E. Walter, a Representative in Congress from Pennsylvania.

Several weeks ago, after a resolution was presented to the House of Representatives from the Legislature of Hawaii requesting an investigation of the infiltration of communism in Hawaii, the Committee on Un-American Activities conducted a very lengthy investigation. Preliminary to the hearings, our staff, together with the FBI, Naval and

Military Intelligence, went over the files and records pertaining to this subject. As a result of the examination made by these investigative bodies, we reached the conclusion that at no time were there more than 160 Communists in Hawaii.

Senator TAYLOR. In all of Hawaii?

Mr. WALTER. In all of Hawaii. That was the maximum strength. The maximum was reached some time in 1946. We have reached the conclusion that since that time the Communist strength has dwindled to the point where today there are no more than 90 Communists in all of Hawaii.

This group is led by militant Communists, who are native Americans sent to Hawaii from the United States.

For the most part the Hawaiian Communists don't know what it is all about. The field is very fertile for the activities of that sort of a group. The workers' conditions were not good, with the result that, as these trained Communists found their way into Hawaii and infiltrated into the labor movement, and into the Democratic Party, I am ashamed to say but I do say quite frankly, they found the type of people who, for economic reasons, were willing to follow leaderships that could offer them more than they had.

The labor movement is dominated by a handful of well-trained Communists who were quite successful in either recruiting people who became Communists subsequent to the time that the agitation started, or Communists who were members of various racial groups, who were given positions of importance in the union. As an example, a man working in the sugar fields, a leader in a certain racial group, found one morning that he had been elected to an executive committee of the union when, as a matter of fact, there had been no election and he had not been a candidate for anything, but the leadership selected that man—and that is a typical case—because of his influence with a certain racial minority group or in a particular industry.

Senator TAYLOR. You mean they elected him to this important office and then put the pressure on him, or made it attractive for him to become a Communist?

Mr. WALTER. In the case I have in mind this man was not a Communist until after he had been selected. Then he was taken to a meeting, which he thought was a union meeting but it was actually a Communist meeting, and he subsequently received a Communist card.

Now it is quite significant that a large number of these people came before our committee and quite frankly admitted that they had become Communists in some manner or other, unwittingly usually. Many of them broke with the Communist Party when they saw that they were actually in an international movement and not merely members of an organization that was set up for the purpose of endeavoring to improve the lot of the workers.

I believe that as the result of the investigation the Committee on Un-American Activities held the members will continue to decrease. While there are 90 today, it is my guess that before the end of this year there will not be over 40 Communists left in all of the islands. The people are aware of what the situation is. The people realize full well that they have been duped and, for the most part, they do not care to be associated longer with that sort of movement.

Now as to the infiltration into the Democratic Party, that too is understandable. In certain sections of Hawaii the Democratic Party was not strong, was not organized, so it was a comparatively simple matter to select somebody in a particular area in Honolulu, have him elected as a committeeman, and then of course in that manner endeavor to obtain control of the party machinery. They succeeded, I believe, in electing four or five Communists or fellow travelers to those positions.

Senator BUTLER. Congressman, on the same theory, could we assume that it will be comparatively easy for the real Democrats to recapture control of their party organization?

Mr. WALTER. I don't think there is any question about it, Senator, because now the people realize just exactly what communism is, just what it means to the islands, and with the spotlight on these people, I am fairly convinced that the decent Democrats will clean house.

Senator BUTLER. Did you get any report on the Territorial convention, the Democratic convention there Sunday?

Mr. WALTER. Well, I know what happened, but, after all, the time was too short for the people who are opposed to this group to organize.

Senator CORDON. What did happen, Congressman?

Mr. WALTER. I understand the left-wing group retained control, and I am certain that is due to the fact that the people who should have control of my party, and who ultimately will have control of it, have not had an opportunity to organize.

Senator TAYLOR. Mr. Congressman, I have devoted a great deal of thought to this question of Communists representing themselves as being what they are not, and getting into other political parties. I have been wondering if it would be a good idea—and of course it may not even be constitutional, as far as that goes—if the Congress could pass a law that any political party could ask of a candidate to be a member of that party, that they had taken an oath that they were not a member of any other political party or organization, and attach a penalty to it if they misrepresented.

Mr. WALTER. You would have the same situation that they have in England, where the coal miners are not represented at labor conventions because the head of a coal-mining union happens to be a Communist.

Senator TAYLOR. Then if the political party wanted to protect itself from infiltration, whether it be the Democrats from being infiltrated by the Republicans, or Communists, or Progressives, or any other cross mixture, there would be some way for them to do that. I have been thinking it might be an excellent idea.

Senator ECTON. Are you afraid of Republican infiltration into the Democratic Party, Senator?

Senator TAYLOR. I am very much afraid of it in Idaho this next election.

Mr. WALTER. Well, that is something that does not disturb us Pennsylvania Democrats. The Republicans have never attempted to infiltrate our party.

Senator CORDON. May I make one or two inquiries, Mr. Chairman?

Senator TAYLOR. Yes.

Senator CORDON. Congressman Walter, you stated in the opening portion of your remarks that your committee reached a conclusion that the high tide of communistic infiltration in the Hawaiian Islands occurred in the year 1946, at which time there were, however, not over 160 Communists in the islands.

Mr. WALTER. Yes, sir.

Senator CORDON. That at the present time there are not over 90 Communists?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Senator CORDON. When you mention Communists, do you include the so-called sympathizers, the fellow travelers?

Mr. WALTER. No, I do not; because it is very difficult to draw the line of demarcation. I have been charged with being a Communist myself because I have been for rent control. As a matter of fact, 2 years ago I was charged with being a Communist on the day I was elected vice president of one of the biggest banks in Pennsylvania. That was because of my position with respect to the measure that was under consideration. Of course you can't draw the line. I mean card-carrying Communists. The people, in some manner or other, became members of the Communist Party and were assigned to various cells of the Communist Party.

Senator CORDON. How did you reach your conclusion as to the number?

Mr. WALTER. As the result of the investigations made by the committee staff working in conjunction with the FBI, Naval Intelligence, and Military Intelligence.

Senator CORDON. Would you say that your estimate is reasonably accurate as an estimate or a count, rather than, perhaps, reasonably accurate as an educated guess?

Mr. WALTER. I think my estimate of 90 is excessive, and my guess is as of today it does not exceed over 60, because almost hourly these people are leaving their associations. It was very interesting to us to hear one witness after another testify he had gotten out of the Communist Party because his wife had found out what communism was, and it influenced him into breaking ties with that group.

Senator CORDON. Did your subcommittee have reported hearings?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, sir.

Senator CORDON. Will those hearings, or a transcript, be available by any chance to this committee?

Mr. WALTER. They will, of course.

Senator CORDON. I think it would be most helpful if we could have access to them.

Mr. WALTER. All right.

Senator CORDON. Now the next question, Congressman—and here I realize that, to a very great extent, it is a matter of opinion, but even so, you have had considerable experience in this particular field of subversive activities and you have a trained staff who had even more experience in the field—what is your view as to the extent of the influence which the card-carrying or non-card-carrying but true Communists, international conspirators, have among the people of Hawaii?

Mr. WALTER. I think that the rank and file of the people, because of

the splendid press in Hawaii, have now become aware of the fact that communism is a world-wide conspiracy. I think they recognize it today for what it actually is. I don't believe that 6 months ago they knew what it was, but I do think that they understand it now, and given the opportunity they will put their own houses in order. As the best proof of that I would like to point out to you the fact that two members of the constitutional convention were deprived of their seats because of their connection with the Communist Party, which certainly indicates to me that that group is bound and determined to take appropriate action to see to it that subversives have no voice in the government.

Senator CORDON. Did you have an opportunity to have access to the information of the Armed Forces intelligence and the FBI?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, sir.

Senator CORDON. And, of course, an opportunity for oral discussion with the representatives of both agencies located in the islands?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, sir; and for months before the investigation was held we were in frequent consultation with the representatives of the several agencies charged with the responsibility of our security. We were furnished with the kind of information that made it possible for us to unmask the whole conspiracy out there.

Senator CORDON. Well, they had both been very kind to me when I was there, as was Governor Stainback. I was interested in knowing just what cooperation you had. Did your investigation, or that of your staff, go beyond Oahu to the other islands?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, sir. We brought witnesses from the other islands to Oahu, and they testified.

Senator CORDON. I think, Mr. Chairman, that is all. I would suggest that at the appropriate time a request be made, through Congressman Walter, for a copy of the transcript of the hearings of his committee.

Mr. WALTER. Consider it as having been made. You will be furnished with a transcript.

Senator TAYLOR. All right.

Senator BUTLER. Mr. Walter, I telephoned you the other day and made the same request personally.

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Senator BUTLER. I appreciate the conversation I had with you at that time, without any particular specification, but your committee seemed to confirm what I had in my report last year in substance.

Mr. WALTER. Your report was quite helpful as a guide to us when we started.

Thank you, Senator.

Senator TAYLOR. Thank you, Congressman.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I think, Mr. Chairman, we are ready to proceed with Mr. King. Mr. Richardson will be here later in the afternoon. Mr. King was my predecessor in Congress. At the present time he is chairman of the Hawaii Statehood Commission and he is also president of the constitutional convention.

Senator TAYLOR. We are glad to have such a distinguished citizen of Hawaii with us today.

STATEMENT OF SAMUEL WILDER KING, CHAIRMAN, HAWAII STATEHOOD COMMISSION, PRESIDENT OF HAWAII STATE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION, AND FORMER DELEGATE TO CONGRESS FROM HAWAII

Mr. KING. Thank you, sir.

Senator CORDON. May I inquire Mr. King, when will your convention meet?

Mr. KING. The convention met on April 4.

Senator CORDON. You mean it has met?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Senator CORDON. And has it concluded its work?

Mr. KING. No; they are still assembled in Honolulu, but a good many of the delegates to that convention are present here as witnesses at this hearing.

Senator CORDON. Would you hazard a guess as to when you may finish it?

Mr. KING. About the middle of June, perhaps. There is no time limit in the law that created the convention.

Senator CORDON. I understand that. I think this committee will be interested in the final product.

Mr. KING. May I make a short summary first before I discuss the convention, Mr. Chairman?

Senator TAYLOR. Proceed in your own way, sir.

Senator CORDON. Pardon me. I was referring to the final product, which has not yet come out of the convention.

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, as Delegate Farrington has said, my name is Samuel Wilder King. I am chairman of the Hawaii Statehood Commission, a special agency of the Territorial government created by the legislature to promote statehood. I am president of the constitutional convention, which was also established by authority of our legislature. I have served in Congress as Delegate for Hawaii for 8 years, a period of four terms, between 1935 and 1942.

For my personal record, I am a native-born citizen of Hawaii and of part-Hawaiian ancestry. I was appointed to Annapolis in 1905 from Hawaii, by the Delegate serving in Congress at that time. I served in the Navy a total of 27 years, in the Regular Navy, and in the Reserves, and I served through both World War I and World War II. My tour of duty in World War II was in the central Pacific, in Samoa, at Eniwetok, and Saipan, and ended up at the war's end in Japan where I was port director at Wakanoura, the port where the Sixth Army disembarked, as part of the United States Army of occupation.

When it was known that this committee was going to grant hearings on the statehood bill, H. R. 49, and the companion bills introduced in the Senate, there was a great deal of interest in Hawaii. We have here perhaps 50 witnesses, and many more would have come if they had any assurance that the committee would be able to give them time to be heard, or that their testimony would not be in duplication. Among those who have come here, there are 20 members of our legislature. The whole Hawaiian Legislature consists of 45 members—15 senators and 30 representatives—and we have 20 members of

our legislature here, including 9 senators and 11 representatives. There are six of us who are members of the statehood commission, myself and five others, and there are four gentlemen here representing our county governments, and a great number of civilians, private citizens, representing industry, business, and the professions. As I say, many more would have come if they thought it would help.

We have been interested in statehood ever since I can remember. As a matter of fact, we were interested in statehood before some of the present States became States. I don't know whether any members of the committee realize it, but Hawaii was led into the American pattern of life and culture long before annexation. Hawaii never was a part of any foreign country; it was always a small independent nation, ruled by its own Hawaiian king, and then was a republic until annexation came.

From the very earliest days, right after its discovery by Captain Cook, the culture of Hawaii has been trained along American and British lines. In the days of the monarchy the British had a great deal of influence in Hawaii, but gradually that influence diminished and American influence became predominant.

The early traders and settlers were American and north European. The American whaling fleet made Hawaii its berth during the winter seasons.

The American missionaries brought Christianity to Hawaii in 1820, which is a long time ago. The Hawaiian language was gradually replaced by the English language; and, as a matter of fact, English was the legal language in 1890, 8 years before annexation. The coinage used was American, and the Government was set up in the framework of American democracy. As a matter of fact, the missionaries brought the ideas prevalent in New England in 1820, right after the period when this Nation was founded, and they had the same ideas in their heads as to how the government should be worked, as to the division of responsibility between the three branches, legislative, executive, and judicial. So, even in the days of the monarchy we were patterned after a democracy; and, as the king yielded to the demand for greater and greater democracy, Hawaii became almost a part of the United States before the American flag was hoisted on the flagpole in front of the royal palace.

I was born in Hawaii of a Scott father, a naturalized American citizen, who settled in the islands in 1860. My mother was of New England and Hawaiian ancestry. One of her ancestors came from New England and settled in Hawaii in 1793, a contemporary of George Washington. I am not the only one of that category of similar background; there are many more.

The Hawaiian people died off very fast. In 1872 there were only 56,897 people in the whole of Hawaii.

Senator CORDON. What year was that?

Mr. KING. 1872. Those are Hawaiian statistics, and they are fairly accurate. In 1872 there were only 56,897 people in the entire group of islands, the present Territory of Hawaii. They were almost exclusively Hawaiian. There were a handful of Caucasians and a handful of part Hawaiians.

My ancestor married a Hawaiian chiefess at that time, in 1793, and that accounts for my part-Hawaiian ancestry. As I said awhile ago, I

am not the only one in that category. There are hundreds, if not thousands, like me, who are descendants of those early settlers.

When immigration came to Hawaii, it came from the Orient, because there was no possibility of attracting people from Europe. We drew on China and on Japan and on the Philippines and in part from the Portuguese group and Spanish group, Latin people, who are all very fine citizens today. In this group here today there are representatives of every one of those races.

Hawaii, despite the fact that it was a kingdom, did not treat these immigrants as though they were colonials, or as though they were there to serve the purposes of labor and had no other rights or privileges. Hawaii treated them just as the United States treated its immigrants. They were free to enter into any and all the businesses and professions, and as their children were born they went to the public schools of the Territory, where they learned English, and they participated in the life of the community exactly as the children of the immigrants do in this country. They absorbed American ideas a long time ago.

The Chinese people have been residents of Hawaii over 100 years, and the Japanese people 65 years. I think they first came to Hawaii in 1884. All these people were welded together in the American pattern of life. They had no other allegiance. We were never under Spanish dominion. There was a time when we might have become a British colony. Even Russia tried to move on to Hawaii from Alaska, at the same time that they were trying to establish a settlement in the Oregon country and in California, but all of those efforts failed because of the influence of the American people who were guiding the destinies of Hawaii long before annexation.

Those Americans realized that the possession and sovereignty of Hawaii was essential to the United States; that the United States could not even conceive of having another foreign nation gain power in the Hawaiian Islands. So, when annexation was finally achieved in 1898, during the Spanish-American War, it was not a very great change. As a matter of fact, the President of the Republic of Hawaii was made the first Governor of the Territory of Hawaii. Every one of the executive officers were sworn in; took the oath of allegiance to the United States, and continued in the same job. There was not any adjustment needed to be made there. As I say, the language and everything else was already American.

Since that time we have been trying to work for statehood. We were annexed in 1898, 52 years ago. 50 years ago we were established as a Territory by the organic act, an incorporated Territory, and this is almost the anniversary of it. As a matter of fact, the act passed Congress on April 30, 1900, and the anniversary was last Sunday, but it actually did not go into effect in Hawaii until June 7, 1900. So, the anniversary is a little bit ahead of us.

In 3 years after that annexation we petitioned Congress to grant statehood to Hawaii. At the time of annexation we had 154,000 people, built up from the low-water mark of 56,000 in 1872 by immigration. Of those 154,000, 60 percent were aliens, and that included a very large population of Japanese. The United States did not have any concern about the Japanese population at that time, that alien population. Those responsible for annexation realized we were doing the same thing in Hawaii that they were doing here, absorbing the people

who settled in the country, some of them to better their economic situation, others who drifted there by accident, and settled there.

After that first petition, many others were introduced in Congress, from 1903 on. In 1920, our Delegate at that time, Prince Jonah Kūhiō Kalanianaʻole, who had lost his opportunity of becoming King of Hawaii due to annexation and who had given up any idea of being a ruler, but who ran for and was elected to Congress 10 times, and who was well liked and well loved by the Members of Congress, like Joe Cannon and all the other noteworthy Members of the House of Representatives, introduced the first enabling bill, and since then practically every Delegate in Congress has introduced an enabling bill.

In 1935, as Delegate Farrington said a little earlier, because of the concern we felt as to the insecurity of our position, both economic and political, we pressed more strongly for statehood, and also because at that time we felt that Hawaii was mature enough to be entitled to become a State. I was the Delegate at that time. We had a House committee go to Hawaii and make an investigation, and it came back with a very good report. It was signed by three of them who were in favor of deferring action, and two of them for reporting the bill out immediately.

In 1937 a joint committee of Congress, both the Senate and House, went down to Hawaii and made a very exhaustive investigation and wrote a very splendid report. I am sorry that the chairman, Senator O'Mahoney, is not here. He was chairman of the subcommittee that drafted the report. I was a member, the other member being former Representative Eugene B. Crowe, of Indiana. That report was almost a prophecy of what we are facing today. In that report was this statement, which I should like to read. It is not too long. It is headed:

THE FUTURE OF HAWAII

It may be taken for granted that Hawaii will continue to increase in population for some time to come. Its resources have by no means been completely developed. Additional areas are available for the cultivation of foodstuffs for local consumption, or for raising some yet-to-be-determined exportable commodity.

Let me say the flowers on the mantel are samples of one of the new industries. There are others that are springing up.

Hawaii's tourist traffic; its commerce, both by ship and air; and its production of specialty merchandise; are all far from having reached their maximum. The trade of the Territory, now in excess of \$200,000,000 annually, will increase greatly beyond that figure. The development of the islands to their physical limits will continue for some decades. The people will increasingly become more homogeneous in character and outlook. Their aspiration to a fuller, more complete life, will bring about a greater diffusion of wealth.

That has been going on. Senator O'Mahoney expressed some concern about the economic domination. Frankly, that does not exist. That does not exist in any greater degree than in any community where there is a limit to the number of banks, newspapers, or other commercial and industrial organizations that can operate profitably.

The entire strength of the community, with its special background of racial tolerance and social-mindedness, will support the efforts of the workers to obtain a larger share of the products of their industry.

That has come about very rapidly in the last 15 years.

In short, the picture of Hawaii in the future is in embryo the picture of America.

It is obvious that such a community, industrious, prosperous, and progressive, will not be content for long to be held in a subordinate position in comparison with other parts of the Nation. It is hardly conceivable that the United States, dedicated to the very principle of self-government and equal treatment of all its citizens, should long desire to impose any restrictions upon the full measure of self-government to be accorded Hawaii.

It seems to me that statement is very pertinent to this hearing.

Shortly after 1937 the war broke out in Europe, in 1939. I was still the Delegate and I was prepared to have another congressional group go out to Hawaii to check the report of the previous one, but the war prevented. This report recommended that a plebiscite on statehood be held. In regard to the plebiscite held in 1940 I want to stress the fact that it was held under very difficult circumstances, but it resulted in a vote of 2 to 1 for statehood. It was after the war started in Europe, when people's minds were so much concerned with our large Japanese population and when there was some apprehension as to their loyalty, I felt right from the start that the apprehensions were not justified, that such fears indicated a loss of faith in American democracy. That democracy had percolated and had been absorbed by our people to such an extent that there wasn't any doubt in my mind that they would be loyal to the United States. I so expressed myself at that time. Regardless, however, of the difficult circumstances, in that plebiscite the vote was 2 to 1 in favor of statehood.

During the war the entire population of Hawaii was devoted to the prosecution of the war. There was no further opportunity to press for statehood. I wish I could show you the picture as I saw it when I flew back there from Washington in December 1941, within a few days after the attack on Pearl Harbor. The entire population was a military camp. Everybody was doing exactly what they were required to do. There were blood banks, volunteer workers, everyone was devoting his heart and soul to the prosecution of the war, to my mind, to a greater extent than on the mainland. Labor was frozen to the job in order to produce the essential commodities of our industry and also to help in the war effort.

In 1943 Delegate Farrington succeeded me in Congress, and immediately after the war pressed for consideration of the question of statehood again. We had the report of 1946 of the Larcade committee and the report of 1947 of the Welch committee, and the splendid report made by Senator Cordon in 1948, and every one of them was favorable, some of them urging immediate approval of statehood. The only report in opposition was the one made by Senator Butler on the single issue of communism.

We in Hawaii ask what more can we do? What more do we have to do to qualify for statehood? What is lacking in our Territorial record, in our record as citizens, in the record of our youth who went to war, that would justify denying action on statehood at this time?

We have been a Territory for 50 years and we have been asking for statehood for 47 years by petition and by enabling acts, and yet we find ourselves in this impasse.

In 1948, after our bill had passed the House in 1947, it died in this committee. I am not in a position to judge as to the reasons or the justification for it, but certainly in this year, after it had passed the House again with a vote of 262, there is no further justification for

any delay or any deferment or any lack of action. As a matter of fact, I believe the people of Hawaii would be better satisfied if this committee was to report out the bill and it was voted down in the Senate. We think the time for taking a definite position has come. It ought to be decided "Yes" or "No," we are either fit as a State or, we want you to say "We don't want to let you in." Then it will be the duty of Congress to reexamine the status of the Territory of Hawaii, to decide what disposition to make of us. If you decide we are not fit for statehood then how can we justifiably be continued as an incorporated Territory?

There is a question of timing. I don't know how much further time you need for us to prove ourselves. We have done so over the years. Even in the Spanish-American War the whole community was a patriotic American community, while we still had the Hawaiian flag flying over the islands.

In the Spanish-American War our men enlisted in the American forces as they passed through the port of Honolulu and went on their way to the Philippines. I, myself, was a boy around that time when the people of Honolulu turned out as a welcoming committee to help those troops, that came largely from the west, and on their return from the Philippines. In the days of "embalmed" beef instead of real food, we used to feed them, we used to welcome them when they came back from the Philippines and were on their way back to the mainland.

So I say Hawaii has been an American community in essence, in its school system, in its government, and in its appreciation of democratic processes since at least 1870, and we have been an American Territory since 1900. I feel that I express the sentiments of a great majority of the people of Hawaii when I say we feel we are entitled to an answer from Congress, and of course, we believe and hope it will be an affirmative answer.

Senator CORDON. Mr. Chairman, may I make an inquiry?

Senator TAYLOR. Certainly, Senator Cordon.

Senator CORDON. Mr. King, I was very much interested in my visitation in Hawaii, in the steps being taken to plat residential areas in the various parts of the Hawaiian Islands, and particularly the plan looking toward ownership by individuals of their own homes. I would like to know now what has been the progress of that work in the islands?

May I say before you answer that, one of the things that gave me some concern was the lack of widespread home ownership, and I was pleased to notice the forward-looking program that was then in a little more than the developmental stage. I would like to know whether or not it has been carried forward.

Mr. KING. Well, Senator Cordon, it has been carried forward at a rapidly accelerated rate. There is more and more land put on the market to be sold as homes and small farms. The plantations have engaged in a program of making land available to their own employees who wish to purchase them to a great extent. Individual real-estate operators—I happen to be one of them—put in many subdivisions in the urban areas within the last few years.

Let me say one reason land is so closely held in Hawaii is because we have come very rapidly from a sparse population to the beginnings

of a dense population, and the population now will demand a greater distribution of land.

Senator CORDON. Isn't it true, though, Mr. King, that the offshore competitive factors of your two major crops, pineapple and sugar, and particularly the fact that the major user is the United States, and the United States has certain relationships by reason of congressional enactments with some other sugar-producing areas offshore, isn't it true that those factors in themselves militate against any early and sharp and over-all breakdown in your land pattern, insofar as the two major crops are concerned?

Mr. KING. If I understand the question correctly, I would say "yes," for this reason; that agriculture, as we practice it, is a large-scale operation with requires large areas of land and very heavy expenditures of invested capital for carrying the crop on. Sugarcane takes from 18 months to 24 months to mature. Pineapple, the first crop, 18 months, and the second crop 12 months, and after that they have to let the land lie fallow.

There are other speakers who will go into the industrial angle pretty thoroughly. The distribution of land will increase rapidly over the next few years. When Senator O'Mahoney was out there with the joint committee of Congress, he expressed some concern about our trusts, trust estates, and big landed estates. I explained to him then that under the American pattern a man may leave a trust estate to his heirs, and there is a limit to the number of years it can continue. We have the same limitation, I think, in Hawaii that is common to legal jurisdictions here. There are lawyers here that might be able to bring it out better than I can.

Senator CORDON. The greatest trust estate is the charitable trust.

Mr. KING. The greatest one is the charitable trust. That maintains the schools for Hawaiian boys and girls. Two very large ones terminated the other day. The property has been distributed to the owners in fractional shares, and they are beginning to sell it. That process is continuing as time goes on.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, the question of the decrease of the Hawaiian population was brought up in previous testimony. I am Part-Hawaiian, as I said, and the welfare of Hawaiians as a part of the whole community is very close to my heart. When Captain Cook discovered Hawaii there were various estimates of the total population, from 250,000 to 400,000. In this report, Document No. 151 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, an arbitrary estimate of 300,000 people, Hawaiian people, all Polynesians, was made as of the date of discovery, 1778. The greatest decrease was within the next 25 to 40 years. There were no immunities on the part of the Hawaiians against the ordinary ailments that other people had had a lot of experience with, such as colds, measles, chicken pox, which were introduced into Hawaii with the trade with the western world. And the Hawaiians died off pretty fast. Hawaiians ceased to die off about 1872 and began to increase, and then immigration came in, and since then the Part-Hawaiian part of the population has increased tremendously. This comparative table shows that as the pure Hawaiians were decreasing the Part-Hawaiians were increasing. Today there are more Hawaiians with some degree of Hawaiian in their blood than there has been in Hawaii since 1850. There are 85,000 people in Hawaii with some

degree of Hawaiian blood. I myself am one-eighth Hawaiian. There are witnesses here, members of the legislature and others, who are half Hawaiian, and quarter Hawaiian, and various degrees Hawaiian, but we all consider ourselves Hawaiians in the same degree. There are more of us today than there have been in Hawaii for 100 years. The forecast for the future of Hawaii is that before the end of this century practically the majority of the people of Hawaii will have some portion of Hawaiian blood. In my own case, I have five children and six grandchildren, and the process is going on in every other part of the Hawaiian Islands. We are a very prolific race. The fact is the birth rate on the part of the Part-Hawaiians is higher than for any other racial group in Hawaii.

I have no fear for the future of the Hawaiian race. I expect they are going to help create a new race, and it will be an American race, no different than in some parts of the United States where we have the Spanish-Americans, or where the French settled in Louisiana are numerous, and where other racial strains predominate, and where you have in parts of America a very heavy degree of Indian blood.

I did not want to discuss the racial question too much. Secretary of the Interior Chapman I think discussed that very completely. I would like to emphasize, however, with all the emphasis and all the intensity that I can, that there is no question in Hawaii of Japanese, Chinese, or what-not. We are all Americans, we are Hawaiians, and our patriotism is American. The people of all our races go to our schools; they take part in our politics, they serve in the legislature, on the county boards of supervisors, without any question as to what their racial ancestry is. We carry out the basic principles of American democracy and ideas, as we have done all these years. "A man is a man for a' that," as Bobbie Burns said. A man is judged on his merits, as an individual and not as a member of any particular racial group.

I was supposed to discuss primarily the constitutional convention, but I could not help but go on with this other angle because I feel so keenly that the committee may not realize that Hawaii has an ancient and honorable American history as well as a Hawaiian history. Many of the great names in American history are great names in our history. Daniel Webster wrote the first state paper that protected us against infringement of our sovereignty by England and France. John Young and Isaac Davis, two American sailors, were advisers to King Kamehameha. Lincoln wrote a letter of thanks, and presented a gold watch, to a Hawaiian missionary who saved the captain and mate of an American vessel who were going to be eaten up by our cousins, the Marquesans, who were cannibals, but Hawaiians were not. The famous explorer, Commander Wilkes, explored the islands thoroughly in the 1840's. He and others made repeated recommendations that the United States by no means lose possession of Hawaii to any foreign country.

Right down the line, Hawaii and America have been so closely intertwined that there was never any other destiny, except for Hawaii to be a part of the United States of America.

It has been suggested that we be a county of California or Oregon. As a matter of fact, we are an older community than either California or Oregon. We were an American seaport carrying on trade in the Pacific area when California was still under the Mexican flag.

Senator TAYLOR. You are not suggesting that we let Hawaii take over California?

Mr. KING. No. You might ask Senator Cordon to annex Hawaii to Oregon. There is a little incident that I might tell you of a young man, William Lee, who was on his way from New York to Oregon, when Oregon was still called the Oregon country, and when he landed in Honolulu we shanghaied him, and made him the chief justice of Hawaii, and he wrote the first constitution in Hawaii based on the common law practiced in New York at that time. What was our gain was Oregon's loss, because he would have been a fine pioneer in Oregon. We had a close association with Oregon in its earlier development. The Astor Fur Co. used many Hawaiians as boatmen and sailors, and they were splendid sailors. There is an Owhyhee Mountain and there is the Wahoo River in Oregon, which are the Anglicized pronunciations of Hawaii and Oahu, that were named in honor of those Hawaiian pioneers.

In the early days in California the forty-niners sent their children to our schools, because we had the first school in English west of the Mississippi, long before there were any schools in the English language west of the Mississippi River.

I think we had one of the earliest newspapers in the English language west of the Mississippi River.

We shipped wheat and produce to California in the days of 1849. Later, of course, California grew so fast and so big that we now buy about two-thirds of its rice crop. We are a very big purchaser of California products.

One of my own ancestors was the first American trader up and down the California coast, trading American merchandise for hides and tallow.

Hawaii is not so far from the mainland when time is computed in these days. I could have left Honolulu last night, or the night before, and been here now. Many of these gentlemen left Honolulu Saturday morning and were here Sunday morning. One left Saturday night and was here Sunday night. So time and distance does not mean very much now.

In our effort to achieve statehood, Mr. Chairman, we have reexamined our American history, and it is our American history. We discovered there were about 15 Territories that had not had an enabling act passed by Congress, or 15 States, for they had not all been Territories, but there were several of them that never had the Territorial status, such as Vermont, Maine, West Virginia, Texas, and California. But there were others that had been organized Territories in exactly the same status that Hawaii occupies today, that had done the same thing we are now doing, while waiting for the passage of an enabling act. They went ahead on their own and held a constitutional convention which was in some cases authorized not even by the legislature but by gubernatorial decree, and among them there are States like Florida, Iowa, Oregon, and Tennessee. You recall Andrew Jackson was a member of the Tennessee group that decided they wanted to be a State and they held a constitutional convention, adopted the constitution and elected a governor and a State legislature, two Senators and Representatives, and came here to Washington and said, "Please seat us," and Washington seated them, and that is all there was to it. Other States have done the same thing.

We are not trying to be presumptuous. We are following the best Amercian procedure and precedent in having the constitutional convention without having to wait for the passage of H. R. 49.

But we do want Congress to pass H. R. 49, for many reasons; it gives approval to what we have done so far, and we urge that that approval be granted. We are carrying out the provisions of H. R. 49 to a very large extent in this constitutional convention that we are holding now under the authority of our own legislature, in the election of the delegates and other provisions. However, if H. R. 49 were passed without amendment and made the law of Congress we would have to go ahead and hold elections all over again, and collect a new group and waste all the effort and time and the money that was put into our effort so far.

So we urge, for that reason, that there be an amendment to H. R. 49 that will confirm what we have done to date. This act of our own legislature says should Congress pass legislation authorizing a constitutional convention the provisions of our act will be superseded, naturally, by the congressional act, but if some companion amendment is not incorporated in H. R. 49 we will have to repeat what we have already done.

Now the convention elected 63 delegates from all over the Territory. The election districts are so zoned that no section of Hawaii is without representation in this constitutional convention, no county or large subdivision of a county.

Senator BUTLER. Is the representation on a proportional basis as to population, Mr. King?

Mr. KING. Yes, and as to the other islands they have a little heavier representation. Their representation was about delegate to, I would say, around 2,500 votes, if my recollection is correct. I have the figures here. On Oahu there is a little higher number of voters per delegate. Then there are provided in each island certain delegates-at-large, as we call them. In other words, taking Oahu as an example, in the fifth district, with about 30,000 voters, they elected six delegates-at-large from the whole district, and then 12 more from smaller districts or precinct groups, so that there was a good cross-section of the whole community, both as to race and as to vocation, and as to the general character of the population. About 17 of those delegates are here.

The work of the convention has gone on, but, nevertheless, it has been interrupted to permit these delegates to appear here, because many of them are members of the legislature and of the statehood commission and of the county government.

I have here a group of photographs and brief biographies, of every one of the 63 delegates. If the chairman would permit, I would like to incorporate those in my statement. Not the photographs, of course.

Senator TAYLOR. We will put them in as part of the record, and we will keep the entire document as an exhibit.

Mr. KING. Thank you, sir. They are educators, members of the legislature, members of the county government, doctors, dentists, law-years—about 16 lawyers; they represent every type of citizen of Hawaii, every racial group. There are 27 of Caucasian ancestry, 19, if I recollect correctly, of Japanese ancestry, 11 Hawaiian and Part-Hawaiian, and 4 of Chinese ancestry. It just happens to break

that way. There were some of Filipino ancestry that were candidates but they did not get elected. Our Filipino citizen group is still a new one, but it is fairly large and in no time we will have men of the Filipino race being elected to public office and serving alongside of the others, without any question as to their race whatsoever. They will just be American citizens who have run for office and been elected.

Senator TAYLOR. I want to say personally that is a very wonderful thing that is happening. It is wonderful to be able to prove it can happen, because it seems the only hope of mankind to escape extinction is when the day may come that we all can sit down together and follow the example of Hawaii.

Mr. KING. Thank you, sir. That was going to be my closing statement.

(The documents referred to follow :)

[From Honolulu Star-Bulletin]

MEET YOUR CONVENTION DELEGATES

GARNER ANTHONY, FOURTH DISTRICT, OAHU

As attorney general from 1942 to 1944, he was a leader in the Territory's long fight to modify martial law.

A Honolulu resident for 23 years, Mr. Anthony is a graduate of Swarthmore College, Pa., and Harvard law school in 1926.

He is now a member of the law firm of Robertson, Castle & Anthony.

In private practice he has represented successfully many clients claiming damages resulting from martial law.

He was a sergeant in the field artillery during the First World War.

C. NILS TAVARES, FOURTH DISTRICT, OAHU

The former attorney general and president of the Bar Association of Hawaii has had wide experience in public service.

He was educated in Maui schools and is a graduate of the University of Michigan. He was in the attorney general's office from 1927 to 1934 and drafted a majority portion of the Territory's tax law revisions in 1932.

He has been special counsel to the legislature and city-county of Honolulu at various times. He returned to the attorney general's office in 1941 and was attorney general from 1944 to 1947.

Mr. Tavares is a member of the law firm of Pratt, Tavares & Cassidy. He has also been chairman of a statehood subcommission.

BENJAMIN O. WIST, FOURTH DISTRICT, OAHU

An island educator for more than 30 years, he was dean of the University of Hawaii Teachers College for 17 years.

He is also author of a book on the development of Hawaii as a part of the American pattern.

He has been chairman of a commission which reorganized education in Samoa and is now a member of the Navy's Committee on Education for Guam and the Trust Territory.

Dean Wist is also a member of the University of Hawaii board of regents and has been a visiting professor recently at Yale University and the University of California.

W. HAROLD LOPER, FOURTH DISTRICT, OAHU

Now superintendent of the department of public instruction, he has been with the DPI and in other governmental executive positions since he arrived here in 1921.

He was director of liquor control for 2 years during the war. He was also co-chairman of the Territorial war labor board, and has been arbitrator, mediator and member of several emergency boards dealing with labor disputes.

Shortly after Pearl Harbor, he directed fingerprint centers throughout the city. Dr. Loper has been superintendent for the last 3 years.

WILLIAM H. HEEN, FOURTH DISTRICT, OAHU

Chairman and vice chairman of the legislative hold-over committee this term, he has been a member of the Territorial senate since 1927.

A practicing attorney, Senator Heen has been deputy attorney general, 1915-17, judge of the first circuit court, 1917-19 and city-county attorney of Honolulu, 1919-25.

A graduate of the University of California, Senator Heen has argued statehood in Washington, been chairman of a special statehood commission subcommittee to draft part of a model constitution, and a member of the 1947 legislative committee on statehood.

HERBERT K. H. LEE, FOURTH DISTRICT, OAHU

A member of the house of representatives for two terms he is now a senator, with a broad background of statehood experience.

He went to Washington in 1947 to urge statehood for Hawaii before the Public Lands Committee, which voted unanimously in favor of the 1947 Enabling Act.

The statehood commission appointed him chairman of a special committee to draft part of a model constitution.

He is a graduate of McKinley High School, attended the University of Hawaii, and was graduated from Yenching University in Peiping, China.

A practicing attorney, he earned his law degree at the University of Michigan.

ARTHUR K. TRASK, FIFTH DISTRICT, OAHU

An attorney and Democratic party official, he is the son of David K. Trask, a veteran party leader.

He received his law degree from Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

After 3 years of service with the territorial department of public works, he entered private law practice with his father, a district court practitioner.

He was a member of the equal rights commission for years, and secretary of the 1940 statehood plebiscite campaign.

CLARENCE Y. SHIMAMURA, FIFTH DISTRICT, OAHU

A political newcomer, the Honolulu-born attorney served as district judge in Waialua from 1937 to 1943.

He attended Honolulu public schools and the University of Hawaii. He was graduated from Oberlin College in 1929 and received his law degree at Harvard in 1933.

Active in community affairs, Mr. Shimamura is now president of the Robert Louis Stevenson intermediate school PTA, and a member of the board of managers of the Nuuanu YMCA and of the Honolulu council, Boy Scouts of America.

FRED OHRT, FIFTH DISTRICT, OAHU

He is in his first elective office but has a record of 30 years of public service, including the job of chief engineer and manager of the Honolulu board of water supply since 1929.

Born on Maui, he attended St. Louis College in Honolulu, the University of Oregon, and was graduated from Cornell University.

Known as the "Luna Wai," or "Boss of the Water," Mr. Ohrt is credited with the creation of Honolulu's modern water system.

He has aided in drafting many laws and has been a member of the board of trustees of the territorial retirement system for 10 years.

SAMUEL WILDER KING, FIFTH DISTRICT, OAHU

Known as the "statehood man," the former delegate to Congress is now chairman of the Hawaii statehood commission.

Born and educated in Honolulu, he was one of the first men with Hawaiian blood to graduate from the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md. He retired from the Navy in 1924 and was elected delegate in 1935. He served until 1942, when he retired to rejoin the Navy.

He headed the governor's emergency housing committee after the war, was chairman of the GOP territorial convention in 1948 and delegate to the 1948 national convention.

He is active in the Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, Order of Kamehameha, Hawaiian Historical Society and the Commercial club.

HERBERT M. RICHARDS, FIFTH DISTRICT, OAHU

A businessman of varied interests, he is a former supervisor and two-time unsuccessful Republican candidate for mayor of Honolulu.

A native of Honolulu, Mr. Richards is a graduate of Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

His business interests have included agriculture, public utilities, automobiles and restaurants.

He has been president of the Hawaiian Board of Missions, treasurer of the Boy Scout council, treasurer of Kalihi Union church and a director of the YMCA.

CHUCK MAU, FIFTH DISTRICT, OAHU

Responsible for getting the "immediate statehood" plank in the 1948 national Democratic platform, he has been a Honolulu attorney for 15 years.

He has been elected to the Honolulu city council council board of supervisors four times and is currently on the board. He is also a former deputy attorney general.

Supervisor Mau has been a director of Leahi Hospital, child and family service, Honolulu community theater, Jaycee Oldtimers, Mid-Pacific Institute, Hawaiian-Chinese Civic Association, YMCA and the Society for Crippled Children and Adults.

NANCY CORBETT, COMBINATION O, OAHU

The wife of Circuit Judge Gerald R. Corbett is a veteran in community affairs, although a first-time candidate.

A native of Providence, R. I., and a graduate of Smith College, Mrs. Corbett first came to Hawaii in 1921 for several years as a school teacher. She then toured Europe, returning here in 1931.

She has been in the educational department of the academy of arts for 15 years. For the last 3 years she has been executive secretary of the Honolulu Community Theatre.

Recently she has been a member of the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce educational committee, which has been preparing recommendations for the convention.

JOHN K. LAI, COMBINATION O, OAHU

Businessman-musician, Lai, another newcomer to politics, is an active sponsor and promoter of instrumental music in the islands.

He is founder and president of the Metronome Music Co., of 76 S. Hotel St., of Ko-Lae Manufacturing Co., producing monkey pod and koa wood ukuleles, and a former member of the Honolulu symphony orchestra.

Mr. Lai was born in Honolulu and was graduated from McKinley High School in 1931.

He is also a member of the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce and a sponsor of the Calling All Girls club.

FLORA K. HAYES, COMBINATION P, OAHU

In her five terms in the legislature she has been chairman of the education committee four times.

In 1943 she initiated the kindergarten system, now spreading throughout the Territory.

In 1947, she was one of four representatives sent to Washington to represent Hawaii at the House statehood hearings.

Mrs. Hayes is past president of three groups—the Hawaiian Civic club, the Hawaii Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the Kamehameha Alumnae association. She is the wife of Dr. Homer Hayes.

DR. HAROLD S. ROBERTS, COMBINATION Q, OAHU

An industrial relations expert, the doctor is chairman of the business and economics department of the University of Hawaii.

A graduate of New York City College and Columbia University, Dr. Roberts has represented the United State Government at several international economic conferences.

He is acting director of the industrial relations center at the university and was a member of the Governor's emergency board during the longshore strike last year.

He has acted as mediator in several utility disputes, is chairman of the tripartite Territorial employment service advisory council and a member of the YMCA board of governors.

HEBDEN PORTEUS, COMBINATION Q, OAHU

A long-time statehood supporter, he has been a Territorial house member for the last five terms.

A graduate of Punahou, University of Hawaii and Harvard Law School, he was cointroducer of the constitutional convention act in 1949, and the 1947 statehood commission act.

He is now chairman of a commission subcommittee drafting a portion of the model constitution, and chairman of the statehood subcommittee of the legislative hold-over committee.

He has appeared as a prostatehood witness before numerous congressional committees.

DR. SAMUEL K. APOLIONA, JR., COMBINATION R, OAHU

Dentist and well-known athlete and coach, he is the first Hawaiian-Chinese to become president of the Japanese club, McCully Makule.

Raised in a Palama tenement he attended Kaiulani, Kamehameha and St. Louis College and was graduated from the University of Southern California College of Dentistry.

He has coached basketball at St. Louis and baseball at Roosevelt and Kaimuki High Schools. He is a former coach and co-owner of the Apollos basketballers, coach of the Cromwell-Hawaiians and general manager of the Riger baseball team.

He is now director of the St. Louis and McCully community associations.

DR. KATSUMI KOMETANI, COMBINATION R, OAHU

A veteran of the famous One Hundredth Infantry battalion, the dentist was elected in the primary in his first political attempt.

He attended McKinley High School, Mid-Pacific Institute, the University of Hawaii and was graduated from the University of Southern California School of Dentistry.

Dr. Kometani is now chairman of the Honolulu city-county board of parks and recreation, a trustee of the Moiliili Community Association, chairman of the Hawaii Veterans Memorial Fund and a member of the board of directors of Trans-Pacific Airlines.

HENRY A. WHITE, COMBINATION S, OAHU

Elected in the primary in his first political try, Mr. White has been president of the Hawaiian Pineapple Co. since 1941.

Born and educated in Honolulu he started his business career as a milkman while a student. In 1921 he went to work for Castle & Cooke, Ltd., as a book-keeper and rose to executive vice president.

He is a member of the board of directors of Castle & Cooke, Ltd.; Honolulu Gas Co., Ltd.; Pacific Refiners, Ltd.; Andrade & Co., Ltd.; and the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce. He is also finance committee chairman of the convalescent nursing home

DR. NILS P. LARSEN, COMBINATION S, OAHU

An internationally minded pathologist the doctor has been a Hawaii resident for 27 years.

He was born in Stockholm, Sweden, and educated at Massachusetts Agricultural College, Cornell University Medical School and Columbia.

He ended his army career in the First World War as a major. Considered an authority on plantation medicine and public health he is one of the founders and leaders of the Hawaii chapter of the United World Federalists.

ALEXANDER H. F. CASTRO, COMBINATION T, OAHU

The young president of the Honolulu Junior Chamber of Commerce is a realtor and vice president of A. D. Castro & Co., Ltd.

New to politics, he is a graduate of Punahou and the University of California at Berkeley. During the war he served in the Navy and left the service as a lieutenant commander.

Last year he was chairman of the Forty-ninth State Fair. He is a member of the board of directors of the Mental Hygiene Society and of the Honolulu Community Theatre.

During 1947 and 1948 he was acting French consul here, and commercial agent for the French Republic.

ELIZABETH R. KELLERMAN, COMBINATION T, OAHU

Lawyer, mother, and PTA leader, she is one of five women elected to the convention.

Mrs. Kellerman is the wife of George Kellerman, a vice president of the Bishop Trust Co., Ltd.

She was born and raised in North Carolina, and was graduated from Sweet Briar College, Va., and the Columbia University Law School.

Before coming to Hawaii in 1940 she served on the legal staff of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. She is now the mother of two sons and chairman of the legislative committee of the Hawaii Congress of Parents and Teachers.

JAMES K. TRASK, COMBINATION U, OAHU

The young vice president of Oahu Insurance Co. was chief deputy clerk of the circuit court from 1936-43.

He was educated at St. Louis College and the University of Hawaii.

He is a member of the Territorial house of representatives.

Mr. Trask is also an active member of the Police Reserves, Hawaiian Civic Club, Windward Oahu Community Association, Lions Club and the St. Louis College Alumni Association.

EDWARD B. HOLROYDE, COMBINATION U, OAHU

With the Kahuku plantation since 1934, Mr. Holroyde is now assistant manager.

The 39-year-old father of two is a graduate of Punahou, and attended the University of Hawaii.

In 1948, he directed the Community Chest drive in rural Oahu.

He was recently appointed a member of the Koolau district soil conservation committee.

DR. MASAO KANEMARU, COMBINATION V, OAHU

A dentist-athlete and political newcomer, Dr. Kanemaru was amateur wrestling champion of Hawaii in 1934.

Named Wahiawa's "Young Man of the Year" in 1948, the young doctor is a graduate of Leilehua High School, attended the University of Hawaii, and received his dental degree from the University of Southern California in 1938.

He is a former president of the Wahiawa Community Association, and the Wahiawa Chamber of Commerce. He is deputy district governor of the Lions Club.

He also serves in executive positions with the YMCA and the Boy Scouts.

YASUTAKA FUKUSHIMA, COMBINATION V, OAHU

A 33-year-old Honolulu attorney, he served with both famous Nisei units—the One-hundredth Infantry Battalion and the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team—during the war.

He is a graduate of Leilehua High School, the University of Hawaii, and Harvard Law School.

During the latter part of the war he was on the prosecution staff of the war crimes detachment in Manila and Tokyo. He was assistant city-county prosecutor from 1947 to 1948.

He was clerk of the house judiciary committee during the last regular legislative session. Elected outright in the primary, Mr. Fukushima practices law in partnership with James M. Morita.

ED C. BRYAN, COMBINATION W, OAHU

Born and educated on Oahu he has been housing director of Ewa Plantation Co., since 1947.

A graduate of Leilehua High School in 1937, he attended the Colorado School of Mines in Golden, Colo., on a scholarship.

He has held various engineering positions here and on the mainland, and was in the Army Signal Corps for 4 years during the war.

He is now Leeward Oahu district commissioner of the Boy Scouts, and president of the Ewa Recreation Association, the Ewa Precinct Improvement Council and the Ewa federal credit union.

GEORGE DOWSON, COMBINATION W, OAHU

Nineteen years with the Territorial department of public instruction, he is principal of the Waianae elementary and intermediate school.

He was born in Ewa, and graduated from Punahou and the University of Hawaii.

Mr. Dowson is director of the Waianae Civic Association, and past president of the Leeward Oahu Lions Club. He is also a member of the rural Oahu YMCA board of managers, and of the Boy Scout Council.

CHARLES E. KAUHANE, COMBINATION X, OAHU

The Democratic floor leader of the house, he is a former deputy coroner and deputy sheriff.

The father of four, Mr. Kauhane is Democratic national committeeman from Hawaii and has been in the legislature continuously since 1943.

He was born and raised in Honolulu and is a graduate of St. Louis College.

A member of the Hawaii Statehood Commission, the 44-year-old politician also owns and manages a restaurant. He is a life member of the Hawaiian Civic Club.

FRANK Y. KAM, COMBINATION X, OAHU

A one-term member of the legislature, he was born, raised, and now does business in Kalihi.

The owner of Frankie's Market, Mr. Kam was a 1948 Man of the Week. He was the first president of the Kalihi Golf Club, president of the Oahu Retail Food Dealers Association, and a member of the Kalihi-Palama Council and the Kalihi YMCA.

He is also a member of more than a dozen city-wide organizations.

TRUDE M. AKAU, COMBINATION Y, OAHU

She is the mother of six and the wife of George H. Akau, chief of the bureau of pure food and drugs in the Territorial health department.

This is her first political office, although she is vice president of the Hawaii Congress of Parents and Teachers. She was born and educated in Boston, Mass., and came to Hawaii about 20 years ago.

She is a graduate of the University of Hawaii, president of the Puunui Community Association, secretary of the Oahu Community Council, and a member of the Oahu Health Council and Disaster Relief Committee.

HIRAM L. FONG, COMBINATION Y, OAHU

The speaker of the house of representatives and chairman of the legislative hold-over committee, Mr. Fong has been a member of the legislature every term but one since 1938.

The 42-year-old businessman-attorney was born in Kalihi and educated at McKinley High School, the University of Hawaii, and Harvard Law School.

During the war he was staff judge advocate of the Seventh Fighter Command as a major.

He was GOP floor leader of the House in both 1945 and 1947, and is the first pure Chinese ever to be elected speaker.

He is senior partner in the law firm Fong, Miho & Choy, president of Market City, Ltd., president of Ocean View Cemetery, and coowner of the Alakea Building.

JAMES F. GILLILAND, COMBINATION Z, OAHU

Once secretary to Prince Jonah Kalaniani'ole, Delegate to Congress, he was a member of the Honolulu Board of Supervisors for 6 years, 1934-40.

He was also a member of the Territorial house during the 1947 legislative session. Born in Honolulu, he attended St. Louis College, Georgetown University, and received his law degree from Harvard University.

He has also been deputy United States attorney, chief deputy sheriff and coroner, and city-county attorney for two terms.

STEERE G. NODA, COMBINATION Z, OAHU

Now serving his first term in the house of representatives, Mr. Noda has been an interpreter for the district court for 14 years.

A 56-year-old father of four, he was also a deputy collector with the Internal Revenue Bureau for 6 years.

He was educated at Royal School and Mid-Pacific Institute. His athletic activities are varied, including judge of AAU wrestling tournaments since 1936 and official umpire of the Hawaii senior baseball league, 1926-30.

He has also been a member of the Kalihi YMCA and a Boy Scout committeeman.

NELSON K. DOI, FIRST DISTRICT, EAST HAWAII

One of the youngest delegates, the 28-year-old lawyer has been deputy county attorney since his graduation from the University of Minnesota in 1948.

Mr. Doi was born at Puna, T. H., and attended Hawaii public schools and the University of Hawaii. He is a former UH student body president.

He was secretary-treasurer of the Minnesota Law School Council and is a member of Gamma Eta Gamma law fraternity.

He was married last year.

TOM T. OKINO, FIRST DISTRICT, EAST HAWAII

A Big Island lawyer since 1932, the former Hawaii county attorney was elected in the primary.

Mr. Okino was born and raised on Hawaii. He attended Oberlin College, Ohio, and received his law degree from Harvard in 1932.

Since then he has been district magistrate, 1934-39; deputy county attorney, 1939-45, and county attorney, 1945-48.

He has been in private practice since then.

RICHARD LYMAN JR., COMBINATION A, EAST HAWAII

An agriculture expert and former school teacher, he is now manager of the Lyman estate.

He was born in Hilo, and was graduated from Hilo High School and the University of Hawaii, where he majored in agriculture.

He taught on Kauai, Oahu, and Hawaii before the war. He then became a civilian employee with the army engineers. In 1944 he was employed by the foreign economic administration to supervise agriculture in the central Pacific.

He was head of Kulani prison until he resigned to become manager of the estate.

JOE T. YAMAUCHI, COMBINATION B, EAST HAWAII

Now serving his first term as representative, he is a Hilo businessmen and tax consultant.

The 31-year-old war veteran is with Payless Appliance Store. During the last session of the legislature he was chairman of the veterans and military committee.

He is a graduate of Waiakea-uka School, Hilo High School, and the University of California.

Mr. Yamauchi is a member of One Hundredth Infantry Battalion Veterans' Club.

JAMES K. YAMAMOTO, COMBINATION C, EAST HAWAII

Probably the only delegate to list himself unemployed, he was a Hilo Electric Light Co. employee for 19 years.

Mr. Yamamoto lost his position last year when the company liquidated its merchandise department.

Born in Hilo, he was graduated from Hilo High School in 1931. He has been active as a professional basketball and football referee. He has also organized several athletic clubs on the island.

He is a member of the Kapiolani school PTA, former executive secretary of the Young Buddhist Association, and now president of the United YBA of Hawaii.

THOMAS T. SAKAKIHARA, COMBINATION D, EAST HAWAII

A member of the house of representatives six times since 1933, he is now a district court practitioner.

He was born and raised in Hilo and is a graduate of Hilo High School.

The veteran lawmaker was also clerk of the 1945 judiciary committee. Back in office in 1947 and 1949, he was chairman of the agriculture committee.

He is now a member of the executive committee of the Republican Hawaii County Committee.

CHARLES A. SILVA, SECOND DISTRICT, WEST HAWAII

A Kohala dentist for 20 years, he has been a member of the Territorial senate since 1934 and is now senior Republican member of the group.

Born in Hawaii, he is a graduate of Kukuihaele school on Hawaii, St. Louis College, and the University of St. Louis in Missouri. He also did postgraduate work at the University of California.

He has been president of the Kohala Lions Club, manager of the Kohala baseball team, and a member of the statehood commission.

EARL A. NIELSEN, SECOND DISTRICT, WEST HAWAII

A native Missourian, he came to the islands in 1936 to manage Station KHBC in Hilo.

He has been a member of the house for the last two sessions and was chairman of the 1947 health committee.

From 1940 to 1945 he was with the Federal Communications Commission and is now operating his own radio, appliance, and photo shop in Kona.

The father of four, he is a member of the Kona Civic Club, the Kona Lions Club, and the Kona Parent-Teachers Association.

FRANK LUTZ, COMBINATION E, EAST HAWAII

An ILWU unit chairman for 3 years, he was elected in the primary.

Mr. Lutz is now business agent for the Onomea-Hakalau sugar workers' unit.

As an Army technical sergeant he participated in the Battle of the Bulge during World War II and won the Bronze Star.

He is a member of the Portuguese Civic Club of Papikou and is the father of four children.

TERUO IHARA, COMBINATION F, EAST HAWAII

An agricultural teacher, he served nearly 3 years with the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team in the last war.

Born on Hawaii, he is a graduate of Hilo High School and the University of Hawaii.

He has taught at both Molokai High School and Honokaa High School.

He is a member of the American Legion.

SAKUICHI SAKAI, COMBINATION A, WEST HAWAII

A retired businessman, he has been on the Hawaii County Board of Supervisors from 1937.

He also conducts a tax-consultant service for Kohala businessmen now.

Mr. Sakai was born in Kohala and graduated from Punahou in 1914. From 1929 to 1946 he was owner of a general merchandise store.

From 1935 to 1937 he was also an assistant Territorial tax collector in Kohala.

PETER G. KAWAHARA, COMBINATION H, WEST HAWAII

The Big Island High School teacher is a graduate of the Kona public schools and a veteran of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team.

Born and raised on a coffee and vegetable farm in north Kona, he also attended the University of Hawaii and was graduated from Park College, Parkville, Mo.

He is now a member of the Konawaena High School faculty. He has represented Kona 2 years at the Hawaii Education Association conferences and is a member of the HEA legislative committee.

It is his first public office.

HAROLD W. RICE, THIRD DISTRICT, MAUI

A rancher and "retired" veteran politician, he is a graduate of Princeton. The former Republican was a member of the Territorial senate from 1918 to 1934 and in 1940. In 1945 he joined the Democratic Party.

He is also former chairman of the Maui County Board of Supervisors.

Since 1916 he has owned the Cornwell ranch on Maui. He is now a member of the Hawaii Aeronautics Commission and, most recently, chairman of the Democratic "Harmony" Committee.

CABLE A. WIRTZ, THIRD DISTRICT, MAUI

He has been judge of the second circuit court since 1943.

Judge Wirtz was born in Honolulu. He is a graduate of St. Louis College, Santa Clara University, and the Harvard Law School.

In 1939 he was deputy Honolulu city-county attorney and was made attorney in 1941. From 1935 to 1939 he was associated with the law firm of Smith, Wilde, Beebe & Cades.

The father of two, Judge Wirtz is a member of the Rotary Club, the American Bar Association, and the Harvard Law School Association.

His appointment for a second 4-year term as judge was made in 1947 by President Truman.

J. PIA COCKETT, THIRD DISTRICT, MAUI

Now retired, he was a school teacher on Maui for 23 years, from 1898 to 1921.

He was also treasurer of Maui County for 25 years after that.

Mr. Cockett was born on Maui and attended Maui public schools and Kamehameha School. He was graduated from the Territorial normal school in 1904.

HAROLD T. KIDO, COMBINATION I, MAUI

Born and educated on Maui, this is his first public office.

Mr. Kido is a graduate of St. Anthony's College. He has been chief clerk with Baldwin Packers, Ltd., for 17 years.

Prior to that time he was associated with a local dry-goods store.

The father of three children, he is now president of the Kam III Parent-Teachers Association. He is also a member of the West Maui Lions Club.

KAZUO KAGE, COMBINATION J, MAUI

He is an Iao school teacher and sports official elected in the primary.

Born and educated on Maui, he is a graduate of the old Territorial normal school and the University of Hawaii.

His present sports positions are president of the Wailuku Baseball Club and vice president of the Maui Football Officials' Association. He is also president of the Maui Teachers Association.

Among other groups he has served in official capacities are the Boy Scouts, Maui Council of Churches, Maui Chamber of Commerce, and the Maui Lions Club.

W. O. SMITH, COMBINATION K, MAUI

A Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co. division overseer, he is another of the newcomers to public office.

Mr. Smith was born on Maui and educated at schools on Hawaii and Maui. He is a graduate of the University of California College of Agriculture at Davis.

The father of two, he is now president of the Puunene Community Association and vice president of the H. C. & S. Supervisors' Club.

RICHARD P. ST. SURE, COMBINATION L, MAUI

Born on the big island's Parker Ranch, he is now head of the payroll department of Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co.

He is a 1929 graduate of Maui High School. He also attended the University of Hawaii and was graduated from Pacific University at Forest Grove, Oreg., in 1934.

Mr. St. Sure is a former employee of Maui Agricultural Co. He first entered politics when he ran unsuccessfully for the house of representatives in the last election.

ARTHUR D. WOOLAWAY, COMBINATION M, MAUI

A field superintendent for Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co., Ltd., he is active in both community and Republican Party affairs.

Born and educated in Honolulu, he also attended Centralia Junior College, Centralia, Wash., and the University of California.

Now a member of the Maui County Republican Committee, he has managed GOP campaigns on Maui for the last two elections.

Mr. Woolaway is a member of the Rotary Club, the chamber of commerce, Puunene Athletic Association, the Maui Boxing Commission, and the Boy Scout council.

MARGUERITE K. ASHFORD, COMBINATION N, MAUI

One of five women elected to the convention, she is a veteran lawyer of 30 years' experience.

She moved to Molokai in 1946 after retiring from practice in Honolulu. The same year she was appointed district magistrate for Molokai.

In 1944 and 1948 she was a delegate from Hawaii to the Republican National Convention.

After graduation from Punahou, the University of California, and the University of Michigan Law School, she was appointed first deputy attorney general.

She has served every session since 1935, except the last, as counsel to either the senate or the house.

CHARLES A. RICE, SIXTH DISTRICT, KAUAI

The 73-year-old veteran politician-Garden Island rancher was elected in the primary.

He was born and educated in Honolulu and is a graduate of Heald's Business College in San Francisco.

He was a member of the house from 1905 to 1911 and of the senate from 1913 to 1938. After being a delegate to the Republican National Convention in 1912, he joined the Democratic Party in 1936 and was a Democratic convention delegate in 1944.

Mr. Rice is also manager of Wm. Hyde Rich, Ltd., and president of the Atwood Distributing Co., Ltd.

JACK H. MIZUHA, SIXTH DISTRICT, KAUAI

Policeman-teacher-attorney, he resigned from the Kauai County Board of Supervisors when he was elected in the primary.

He led the National Guard detachment which captured a Japanese flier on Niihau shortly after December 7. Later, after distinguished service with the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion in Italy, he was permanently disabled.

Before the war he had been a Kauai schoolteacher for 5 years. He got his master's degree in education from the University of Hawaii in 1936.

After the war he graduated from the University of Michigan Law School, opened law offices in Lihue, was elected to the board of supervisors in 1948, and was appointed magistrate of Waimea last month.

H. S. KAWAKAMI, COMBINATION AA, KAUAI

Businessman elected in the primary in his first political race, he has been a member of the constitution committee of the statehood commission for 2 years.

Born in Japan, he came to Hawaii in 1912 and attended Elele Grammar School and Mid-Pacific Institute.

He went into business for himself in 1926 and now owns a retail store in Waimea, with branches in Lihue and Kapaa.

Mr. Kawakami is a member of the Territorial council on veterans' affairs.

RANDOLPH CROSSLEY, COMBINATION CC, KAUAI

The president of Hawaiian Fruit Packers since 1937, he first came to Hawaii in 1929.

He was born in California and is a graduate of the University of California. He formed the Crossley Advertising Co. when he arrived here and in 1946 originated the Crossley Associates, Ltd., for the growing and distributing of flowers.

A member of the Territorial house of representatives in 1943, he also served on the public utilities commission from 1945 to 1947.

TOSHIO SERIZAWA, COMBINATION DD, KAUAI

A Kauai supervisor since his political debut in 1947, he comes originally from Kona, Hawaii.

He is now traffic representative for Hawaiian Airlines. He has also been in the farm produce business and worked with Trans-Air Hawaii.

In 1948 he was president of the Territorial junior chamber of commerce. He is a member of the Lihue Parent-Teachers Association.

Mr. Serizawa is a graduate of McKinley High School and attended the University of Hawaii.

MATSUKE ARASHIRO, SECOND DISTRICT, WEST HAWAII

He is a veteran of World War II and has been a member of the Territorial house of representatives since 1947. He was born in Hawaii and graduated from Kauai Vocational School. Formerly an employee of McBryde Sugar Co., he is now an automobile salesman for Garden Island Motors. He is an active member of a number of organizations, including the American Legion, the Kauai Veterans' Club, the Kauai Chamber of Commerce, the Kalaheo Civic Club, the Mental Hygiene Society, and the ILWU.

JOHN R. PHILLIPS, COMBINATION P, OAHU

He has lived in Hawaii since 1935. When World War II started he was a Honolulu police force student at the University of Hawaii. During the war he served in the United States Army as a Japanese-language officer. After the war he returned to the university and is now in his senior year in the department of arts and sciences. He has taken an active interest in government and was a delegate to the UNESCO sessions in San Francisco in 1949. The same year he was a delegate to the student state constitutional convention held on the University of Hawaii campus and was chairman of its constitution revision committee.

MR. KING. Certainly it is a fact that in Hawaii we have welded together in one community—one community in purpose, intent, outlook, and ideals—people of very divergent races, and we have proved that democracy does work with people of such racial ancestry. If on the mainland your experience has been mostly with immigrants from Europe, not entirely but mostly, and you thought that in Hawaii, for various reasons, it was not possible with people of other racial background, nevertheless we have developed a splendid American community in those islands out of the people who did come there and settled there.

I am very proud of Hawaii. I think it is one of the outstanding places in the world; it really is. Life is pleasant; it is friendly, kindly; and there is very little animus between individuals. Even our politics is carried out with flowers, dancing, and music. Political opponents have called me names, but it did not mean too much. We were friends immediately after that. It was mainly perhaps to get a few votes away from me or make a few votes for themselves, and I had no animosity toward them on that basis.

I think we deserve a little better consideration from Congress for the successful experiment we have made in proving that American democracy does work with people of Asiatic origin. There has been a good deal of question in some people's minds as to whether it can be done or not, but we have proved it can be done.

I think, from the international point of view—I do not want to repeat the arguments made by the others—Hawaiian statehood is very important to the United States. I think those who doubted the success of the Hawaiian experiment have, to some degree, lost faith in American democracy. They say, "Well, it is fine for certain people but it won't work for others." That is not true today. It works with everybody, given a fair trial and carried out a long enough time.

My colleagues on the statehood commission with me, those who are here from the legislative group and the business group, every one of them represents good individual citizens and good Americans.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would be glad to answer any further questions.

Senator TAYLOR. Are there any questions? If not, thank you very much.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, at this point may we present Mr. Seth Richardson, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States, who conducted the investigation of law enforcement in the Territory of Hawaii in 1932.

STATEMENT OF HON. SETH W. RICHARDSON, CHAIRMAN, PRESIDENT'S LOYALTY REVIEW BOARD AND FORMER ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have some trepidation in coming. I confess I was glad to hear your statement a moment ago, because I don't think I ever heard a statement more appealing than the one just made by Mr. King. It affected me very strongly. I doubt whether there has been a statehood application presented in the way in which that citizen of our country presented the case for his country.

Senator TAYLOR. He spoke from his heart, and it was very interesting.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am not at all sure I can be of any aid, and yet maybe I can. It is by mere chance that I was appointed the head of a delegation to go to Hawaii a number of years ago, at a time when the government of Hawaii hung in the balance, when there was a definite movement on foot to completely withdraw from the Territory any self-government and turn it over to a military commission to govern from that time on.

I had a group of FBI men and went to the islands and spent a couple of months there. We were like a bunch of monks. We were the only visiting delegation that went to Hawaii that did not spend most of its time being entertained. We made a rule when we landed, Mr. Chairman, that no member of the committee or of my organization should accept any private entertainment or give any press interviews.

Well, we stayed there 2 months. I don't know how we could have made a more careful investigation of Hawaii. It was new to us. It was tropical country, as far as I was concerned. I expected to see many strange sights. We went there, we spent 2 months, we examined about

500 selected citizens in Hawaii on all of the general subjects of life in Hawaii, and law enforcement, crime, and everything else that has to do with life in Hawaii. We examined very closely the people, from the president of the university down to the proprietor of the leading red-light district. We had a confidential interview with the Territory's leading bootlegger. We neglected nothing. I confess that I came home one night and I was sitting in the room, and my wife was with me, and she said, "What is the matter with you?" I said, "I am looking at my shoes." She said, "Why?" I said, "The heels of my shoes should be round, because I changed my mind so many times today, I turned around so many times that the heels of my shoes should be round." She thought I was a little out of my mind, but I wasn't.

Now, I made some criticisms of Hawaii when I left there. It is singular to notice that every single criticism I made and which was in the power of the legislature of Hawaii to cure, they cured immediately.

There were some other recommendations that I made that I often felt they never quite understood. The only thing that kept the military commission out of Hawaii was to throw in this commission of mine and say, "Wait until this commission makes an investigation and then do it." By the time we got back, there were other troubles before the Congress, and from that time to this I have always felt that the recommendations that I made, which the islands hated, were the best thing that ever happened to the islands. So I have had this interest in them, when I went into the Pearl Harbor investigation.

Senator CORDON. When did you make your first investigation?

Mr. RICHARDSON. In 1932. When I went into the Pearl Harbor investigation, I wondered why I should be the Hawaiian expert, because you could not deal with Pearl Harbor without dealing with Hawaii.

Of course, the whole world expected that in time of stress and trouble our Americanism in Hawaii would break down. When you stop and think that you can throw a stone from the boulevard into Pearl Harbor, you realize how close the civilian population came to the military and naval construction of Hawaii. It was perfectly amazing to me to feel, in that seething mass of people that are not of our race out there in the Pacific, that there was not a single case of sabotage that came to the surface in Hawaii. There is not a State in the Union hardly that can make a similar claim.

Senator TAYLOR. They did not find one spy in Hawaii during the war?

Mr. RICHARDSON. They never found a single act of sabotage by the residents in the Territory. Of course we left a lot of men in operation in Hawaii, through the consular office, and so forth, that did cause us trouble.

Well, here were a lot of white people, a lot of Chinese, a lot of Japanese, a lot of Filipinos, all mixed up. I can remember yet the astonishment I had the one day I took off from work in Hawaii and played golf, to see the foursome ahead of me of a different race in Hawaii. That was a new one to me. I went and looked at the moving-picture places and was amazed to see the people of different colors and different nationalities. My North Dakota background rose up and I said, "This must be a regular breeding place for crime," and then I picked up a crime report that came to me from my friend Hoover and I found the crime figures for Hawaii were less than in Tennessee. I know that Princess Kawanakakoa said to me one day, when I was

endeavoring to get her to agree that the moral background of Hawaiians was not as good as it should be, "Mr. Richardson, you come from North Dakota?" I said, "Yes." She said, "You have summer for 3 months in the year?" I said, "Yes." She said, "Well, we have it 12 months of the year and if we are only twice as bad as you are with 12 months to sin in, how much better are we over you?" I say that in all seriousness.

Then I tried to get the Hawaiian people in, and they came to me in a body. They were very much taken with the fact that here was one commission that was not being entertained all the while they were there. I tried to get them to tell me about how the white people had misused them, and, Mr. Chairman, I never found a Hawaiian person in the islands who did not speak of his or her white friends with love and affection. "Why," they said, "they are the best friends we have."

Then I turned my attention to the white people. I never found, in all of my investigation in Hawaii, an off-color white person of prominence in the islands, not one. There were some faults that I did find. I found they were a bit lazy, I found they were careless, or they were lax, that they gave a man an important job because he needed it and not because he was smart, and some of my recommendations were that the President should be clothed with power to fill those important places, if necessary, from the mainland. That was enough to arouse their sensibilities, and they have elected their best men to the courts and their best men to the prosecuting office, and I ascribe that to the Richardson influence.

Now I noticed this—and it is a little thing, but it runs right along the line of Mr. King's statement—I would go out of my hotel and I would go to the drug store, an American drug store. I would go on and into the moving-picture house, an American moving picture. I get a suit made and it is made in American style, by people who speak American. It is American from one water's edge to the other water's edge. Even when we went into the Japanese villages and the Japanese homes—because we went into dozens of them—we found **them Americanized**. That is not true in Puerto Rico. That is not true anywhere else under the sun where the land is peopled by other than Americans as it is in Hawaii. The stores look like American stores, the automobiles run there just as they do in one of our towns here.

And yet they criticize the people over there. They criticize them because when you and I go there now and they want to entertain us and they give us luau, why they give us some raw fish, lots of people think, "By God, they are still savages." That is how the people live. They are really doing it like our friends in the West do a rodeo show.

I became impressed with the fact that here is an American community, of a different color mostly, and a different background. I went to the school one night to make an address. I wondered what I could say to those boys up there that would make a hit with them, and I shrank from the task. I was just new there. You would be interested to know I told them the tale of the Kodiak bears in Alaska, and we found a medium of communication between those boys and myself in 2 minutes. They were bear hunters, those kids, just as I was.

I have thought a great deal about this question of statehood for Hawaii. I hate to venture the suggestion, but there were two men on

this committee that have gone into this job. I cannot answer the suggestion that there is too much communism in Hawaii. About 6 months from now we will know something about it, because we have started work on our own in Hawaii to know what the condition is.

There is an over-all theory of great importance that I have been told is running through the minds of the Senate, and that is that we should, as a matter of high Government policy, have no insular States, regardless of what they are, who they are, regardless of anything else, that America should be wholly continental, as far as the United States is concerned. I cannot make any reference to it; I don't know. That would be a matter of high Government policy to be enacted only after the most careful thought, as to whether the future of our Nation, in view of the countries that there are that some day might be considered as States, as to whether that is a good theory. But if it isn't a good theory, how can we square America with keeping Hawaii a Territory? How can we do it? Fifty years we have had them in our schools, where our Congress, of which you are a part, could write the ticket of their daily life politically for 50 years.

The young men who were there when Hawaii came in with the United States are dead now, most of them—the time has been so long. The second generation is dying off, and the third generation is coming up. Are they patriotic? Are they loyal? The people in the islands, the second generation of Japanese, are just as loyal as the second generation of Norwegians or Swedes in my State of North Dakota. We went through some years when they proved they were loyal, but the question is raised, "Do we want Japanese in our Congress?" All those things have their weight. But certainly if there ever was any tribute to American education to a foreign race that paid dividends, it was what happened in Hawaii in this war. When we called on the Japanese second generation for help we got it, and we got good help, of which we are proud, and of which they are proud.

The same thing was true of the Chinese population there. One of the first things I noticed in the Pearl Harbor investigation was the way in which all of the white owners there, these Big Five that are supposed to be so exceedingly selfish in their designs, were there with their offer to the Government to do whatever the Government wanted to do with any piece of property that they had. I am telling you that the Government, through the Military Governor, was treating them in a way that I never approved. But there was nothing in Hawaii to justify it. All of the troubles that Admiral Kimmel had there and that General Short had there, all of that terrible episode for the month after the 7th of December, was not accentuated to the slightest degree by anybody who lived in those islands. They were subjected to some pretty heavy burdens during the time that the war was on, without resentment and without really making a holler that you and I would have made if we were faced with the same thing.

So I have this feeling about it: If we are not ever going to give Hawaii statehood, then adopt this theory that I referred to, that our Nation must always be continental and put an end to the insular aspirations, put an end to it, let it die off, and don't let these young men be growing up in Hawaii hoping to see the day when they are equal with the other States, in the Union, rather than coming here, like they are here now, to ask for this and then be slapped down. It doesn't make better Americans of them.

People say to me, "Are not they better off without statehood?" I don't care whether they are or not. Would not the country be better off if some of us could not vote? That is very possible, but we are not going to argue the matter, except somebody should decide in the city of Washington that we are going to vote. So it is with Hawaii.

I confess that the worst testimonial that we can give to the world as to whether our system will work is whether or not we are still going to deny this community out there, the high-grade community, with high thoughts, high ambitions, high charitable impulses that we have made America out of, are they always going to be held off like poor relations and not be given their right to be a State?

I cannot argue the Communist question, I cannot argue the military question, or any of those questions. We have got them, and we did not take them as a territory, we took them as a partner, and now they come to us decently and they say, "We have got fine people here, we are a law-abiding people, the airplane has brought us close to you, let us be a State and let us have our own Senators, our own government, and stand on our own feet." I think it would be a good thing if you did it.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

Senator TAYLOR. Are there any questions, Senator Cordon?

Senator CORDON. One question. You made a report in 1932. Where can we find it?

Mr. RICHARDSON. There is some interest to that. We took statements from these 500 people in the islands and they all took down their hair and told us what they knew about their neighbors. When the committee here saw the report, which consisted of 14 typewritten documents, the Senate sealed it and put it in the Congressional Library with directions it was not to be investigated by anybody except upon order of the Vice President. Hiram Bingham, who was then head of the Insular Committee, said there would be assassinations in Hawaii if all the people in Hawaii knew what their neighbors said about them.

You will recall at the time I went there it was a little after that horrible episode of the Massie case when the island was literally seething with animosity between the two sides, but the report was made, it is a congressional document. I cannot give you the number of it, but there it is. That is the report that was made and in it are the recommendations.

Senator CORDON. I mean as to the conditions that you found.

Mr. RICHARDSON. In 1932?

Senator CORDON. In 1932.

Mr. RICHARDSON. After 1932 the Congress, or the Senate, were not asking me to make any reports for the Department of Justice.

Senator CORDON. You mean they were not satisfied with that report?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Very much so, I think, but they were not satisfied with the party I belonged to. When you are out of office there are very few reports they ask you for, Senator. You will find that out.

Senator CORDON. I am not new to the game.

Mr. RICHARDSON. But I don't know—after my experience now as a Republican for a good many years, I have now become the standard bearer for the administration, so the papers say, and I don't know whether you ought to give up when you get as old as I am, Senator.

Senator CORDON. It is an open question, isn't it?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Senator CORDON. That is all.

Senator TAYLOR We want to thank you for your statement. I certainly have enjoyed it: I am very happy to have you come up here, because I haven't had the pleasure of meeting you before.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, may I say for the record, Mr. Richardson is quite in error when he figures that we in Hawaii detest him. On the contrary, we hold him in great admiration, and we are deeply grateful for his statement today.

I would like to call as the next witness one of the senior members of the Hawaii Statehood Commission and a member of the constitutional convention, a man born and raised in Hawaii and who has been in Hawaiian politics about as long as anyone that I know of, former Territorial Senator Charles A. Rice, of Hawaii.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES A. RICE, MEMBER, HAWAII STATEHOOD COMMISSION, AND VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE CONSTITUTION CONVENTION AND SENIOR MEMBER

Mr. RICE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Charles A. Rice. I am an independent rancher and farmer on the island of Kauai.

As to my background, my grandfather came to the islands in 1841 as a missionary and vocational teacher of the school. My father was born in Hawaii and I was born in Hawaii.

I have been in the legislature—in the house of representatives four terms, and then I graduated to the senate and stayed there for five terms of 4 years each. So I know something of the history of Hawaii.

I was present when annexation took place. I remember even then that we thought we were going to be a State some day. We talked about it. I am an American by act of Congress, because when you annexed Hawaii you made me an American citizen.

I remember when the Hawaiian flag was hauled down. It is now our Territorial flag, and perhaps will soon be our State flag.

This matter of statehood has been uppermost in all the people's minds for a long time. I remember voting for a statehood resolution in 1905. Of course we did not do very much about it. We went along patiently for years and years.

It is hard to follow these gentlemen that have just talked, like Mr. King and Mr. Richardson. I would just be repeating.

I have been at all your investigations, Mr. Cordon, Mr. Butler, every one of them. I cannot repeat the facts. If I did it would just be repetition, but I would like to say that something ought to be done in this session of Congress.

The people sent me to the constitutional convention for which position I ran as candidate at large on the Island of Kauai; I want to say this is the first time that Oahu has had a majority of votes. They worked a little reapportionment on it. But it goes on harmoniously. The constitutional convention is now meeting in committees.

I have been to a lot of political conventions. I think it was Senator Butler who brought it up, but I was a delegate to that Democratic Convention. I could not be there, I could not be in two places, so I

left my proxy. I don't know just what they did there. Naturally I will find out in a few days, but I think it has come to a time when we in the West say we would like a show-down. We would like you gentlemen to give us statehood. We have earned it. We have had our schooling, we want to graduate, we want our diploma.

There is nothing more I can say. The people that sent me to the constitutional convention—and I am on the statehood commission—they ask this, and we want it.

All the arguments have been answered. I am ready for my questions.

Senator TAYLOR. Senator Cordon.

Senator CORDON. I have asked Mr. Rice many questions over and over again. They are in the record and I will not reiterate them.

Senator TAYLOR. Senator Butler.

Senator BUTLER. I was interested in your statement, Senator Rice, when you said you remember when Hawaii became a part of the United States.

Mr. RICE. Yes.

Senator BUTLER. The thought just occurred to me that you can tell us, in your own way, what the arguments were at that time in favor of becoming a part of the United States, or what brought the matter up. As I read it, it was a voluntary move on the part of the people of Hawaii, that the suggestion came from them.

Mr. RICE. Yes.

Senator BUTLER. I wondered if there was any particular reason for it at the time. It has been said here once or twice I think during the day that we in the United States took an interest in Hawaii because we did not want any other country to take possession of the Hawaiian Islands, and I think it was a fine thing for Hawaii to ask, to become a part of the United States. I think it was a fine thing for them to do it, but is there any particular reason why you want that?

Mr. RICE. Let me see if my memory goes back there. I am along in years. We had a revolution down there, as you no doubt heard, and then we had a provisional government and asked for annexation. The Republican Party, under McKinley, was going to grant us that, and then Cleveland came in and it was withdrawn. They withdrew it, so we had a Republic of Hawaii. In our republic, Mr. King's father and my father, and a lot of others, sat in the constitutional convention. I was going to boarding school and I used to go down in the afternoon and listen to them. That gave me the itch to go to another constitutional convention of my own. I am glad to come over here and have something to say.

Annexation interest came along in 1898, during the war with Spain. This is all history. Dewey, with a fleet at Manila, knocked out the Spanish fleet and one day we woke up and the transports were in Honolulu with United States troops. We were a republic—were we going to be neutral or not? No, we were all wanting to be Americans, and so we took care of the troops. They came ashore and then they went on to Manila and took the Philippines. Then they had an insurrection with Aguinaldo, and that is the time I think the Congress of the United States said, "Well, these are pretty good boys, they let our troops go ashore," and so they said, "We have got to annex them."

This constitution, the organic act of ours, I think, took months, I think 23 months, to develop. Certain people of Hawaii, Judge Frear, and some Senators and Representatives drew up our constitution, the organic act. I was once appointed by the governor as a delegate to help amend this constitution. When Mr. Hill asked that I be made chairman, I came here in 1920 and asked for amendments to our organic act. Soon after that Congress passed the Hawaii Homes Commission Act.

Senator BUTLER. At the time this was all happening, Senator Rice, were economic conditions pretty sound?

Mr. RICE. Pretty sound.

Senator BUTLER. Your economy was built principally around sugar, I presume?

Mr. RICE. Yes; we had our treaty of Pearl Harbor. We had the advantage of the reciprocity treaty.

Senator BUTLER. I was wondering if you were going to make a statement that becoming a part of the United States was really an economic advantage to the people of Hawaii at the time they joined us, that your sugar then would come in without any tariff.

Mr. RICE. Yes; it came in without any tariff, but we always had the Orient at our back. I traveled with Judge Hatch, who had been minister from Hawaii to the United States. He represented the Republic of Hawaii here in Washington as minister. He told me—and this is only hearsay—he told me they were always afraid over here that the Japanese might take Hawaii, and he said even when Sherman was Secretary of State he had made the statement that they must have Hawaii, that it was to the United States' advantage.

I think you have a law on your books that sons of missionaries born outside of the United States could become President, isn't that right? I have heard that said. That is the only class of people outside of the people born in the United States that can become President. Somebody told me that, but I have never verified it.

Senator BUTLER. I just thought that your personal recollections of the conditions that prevailed might be interesting, Mr. Rice.

Mr. RICE. Our economic conditions were pretty good.

Senator BUTLER. That is all.

Mr. RICE. May I go on and say just a word more?

Senator TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. RICE. The gentleman here mentioned there has been a great change in the last few years, that homes have been opened up. When Senator Cordon came to Kauai I took him around in a station wagon, giving over the island, to try to show him as much as I could, when we were through with the formal hearings.

We have opened up on our island. Each of the plantations has opened up big tracts of land, where they sell home sites not only to employees but to anybody that wants them. Of course we have one thing that is to our advantage, we have the home exemption law, that gives them a small tax-exemption. Since the end of the war we have grown by leaps and bounds in building new homes and in promoting home ownership.

I don't think there is anything else that I could add.

Senator TAYLOR. Thank you, Senator Rice. We appreciate your statement, sir.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, we have Senator Burke on our list at this point, but he is going to file a statement and we are going to reserve his testimony to the end.

I am going to call on Representative Hiram L. Fong, the cochairman of the Hawaiian Legislative Hold-Over Committee of 1949, the Speaker of the Hawaiian House of Representatives, and a member of the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention.

Senator TAYLOR. Mr. Fong, we want to welcome you here, sir, as a fellow-American. We are happy to have you appear before this committee.

STATEMENT OF HIRAM L. FONG, SPEAKER OF THE HAWAII HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND COCHAIRMAN, HAWAII LEGISLATIVE HOLD-OVER COMMITTEE OF 1949

Mr. FONG. My name is Hiram L. Fong and I am an American citizen of Chinese ancestry. My father and mother were born in China and arrived in Hawaii when they were 16 and 10 years old, respectively. They married each other in Hawaii through a middleman. I am the seventh child of a family of eleven. My father never returned to China and my mother visited there 20 years ago but she has never mentioned her visit there. She is still living and she is 78 years old.

I have been a Reserve officer in the United States Army for 19 years and during World War II, I served in the Army Air Forces as assistant staff judge advocate of the Seventh Air Force and as staff judge advocate of the Seventh Fighter Command with the rank of major.

My profession is that of an attorney, licensed to practice in all the courts of the Territory of Hawaii and the Supreme Court of the United States. I am a graduate of the Harvard Law School and the University of Hawaii and am a product of the public educational system of the Territory of Hawaii. After passing the bar examination, I was appointed deputy city and country attorney of Honolulu and served in that capacity for 3 years.

I have been a member of the house of representatives for 10 years. In two sessions, I was elected as vice speaker and Republican floor leader and am now the speaker of the house of representatives, vice president of the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention, and chairman of the Territorial Legislative Hold-Over Committee, an interim group of representatives and senators selected to recommend legislation to the next session of the legislature.

As speaker of the house of representatives, I can safely say that each and every member of the house of representatives is unqualifiedly in favor of immediate statehood for the Territory of Hawaii. This statement I have just made is of more significance, especially when, with the granting of statehood, the representation of 18 out of the 30 members now enjoyed by the islands outside of the island of Oahu, will be materially lessened. It will also mean the loss of majority control of the house of representatives by the outside islands. Conversely, the island of Oahu, with about 70 percent of the population of the Territory and now having 40 percent representation will attain majority control of said house. We have been unable for the past 40 years to reapportion our house of representatives. All efforts

on the part of Oahu to reapportion the house have been defeated by the outside islands. However, the desire for statehood is so strong that the outside islanders have been willing to accept it even with reapportionment.

The composition of the house of representatives of the last session of the legislature is truly representative of the political, economic, racial, and social life of the islands. By nationality, there are 14 members of Caucasian or part Caucasian-Hawaiian ancestry, 10 of Japanese ancestry, 3 of Chinese-Hawaiian ancestry, 2 of Hawaiian ancestry, and only 1 of Chinese ancestry, myself. Politically, there are 20 Republicans and 10 Democrats. Professional men, labor leaders, small-business men, representatives of big business, employers, employees, and even housewives are all represented. Of the 30, 11 are college-trained.

This group of representatives, together with members of the senate, were instrumental in bringing to an end the 5-month-long 1949 waterfront strike which completely paralyzed the economy of the Territory. We have not yet recovered from the disaster. Federal intervention, extremely slow in coming and then having failed and realizing that our salvation must come from our own efforts, a special session of the legislature was requested by the Hold-Over Committee. With the complete cooperation of Governor Stainback, the legislature in record time, enacted Act 2 of the special session of 1949, providing for government seizure and government operation of the struck stevedoring companies. At no time during the discussion of this most drastic legislation was there any doubt as to where the representatives of the people stood despite the strongest efforts of the two warring factions, the ILWU on the one hand and the stevedoring companies on the other in opposing the passage of the bill. The vote to pass the bill, which finally ended the alleged Communist-led strike, was overwhelming. The enactment of the special session of the legislature in this regard proves conclusively that we in Hawaii are independent Americans, that no pressure group can dictate to our representatives. It is to be noted that this legislation passed by the Territorial legislature of Hawaii is as courageous a piece of legislation as could have been passed by any State legislature and a type of legislation that even the national Congress has hesitated to consider.

I would like to refer you to some of the provisions of Act 2 of the special session of the legislature:

SECTION 1. Findings and declarations of legislature.—The legislature takes cognizance of the fact that a strike in the stevedoring industry of the Territory of Hawaii has been in effect since May 1, 1949; that the parties to said dispute have carried on extensive collective-bargaining negotiations over a period of more than 6 months and have failed to reach any agreement; that voluntary mediation by the Territory and by Federal agencies has failed; that the Governor has called an emergency board which after full hearings found the facts with respect to the dispute and made a recommendation, which recommendation was accepted on one side but rejected on the other; that the continuous furnishing of stevedoring service, together with all related facilities and services (including terminal services) necessary to the loading and unloading and arrival and departure of vessels at ports in the Territory of Hawaii is essential to the public health, safety, and welfare; that strikes, lock-outs, and stoppage, slow-down, or retardation of services in such stevedoring industry, or in such related facilities and services, imperil the public health, safety and welfare; that a public emergency now exists due to the aforesaid stevedoring strike; that in order to provide for the immediate resumption of services in the present emergency, in the most expeditious and practical manner, it is necessary that the

Governor be authorized to take over and operate the stevedoring companies involved in the dispute, together with such related facilities and services as he may deem necessary to open and keep open to commerce the ports of the Territory of Hawaii.

Sec. 3. Government operations. (a) If upon the taking effect of this Act, the Governor finds that the emergency declared by the Legislature in Section 1 still continues, he shall issue a proclamation of such emergency. Such proclamation shall urge the parties to the dispute to forthwith resume work and operation in the public interest, and it shall state that if such work and operation is not resumed forthwith he will, pursuant to the provisions of this Act, take immediate possession of such stevedoring companies involved in the dispute, together with such related facilities and services, as he shall find necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Under subsection (d) of section 3 we have the following oath, which the employees must take before they are employed:

I, -----, do solemnly swear and declare, on oath, that I am not now nor have I been at any time within the 5 years next preceding the taking of this oath a Communist or a member of the Communist Party; that I have not at any time within the 5 years next preceding the taking of this oath held membership in, paid assessments, dues, or made contributions to any organization or any political party which advocates the overthrow of the constitutional form of government of the United States of America or any change in the Government of the United States of America, except as provided by its Constitution; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; so help me God.

Pursuant to this act, the Government went into operation, and within a few weeks the dispute was resolved.

I would like to read a few sections also from act 3 of the legislature, relative to picketing, to give you an idea as to whether the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii is Communist-dominated.

During any period of Government operations, as provided for by this Act, any of the following shall be unlawful:

(1) For any Government employee engaged in such Government operations to participate in any strike.

(2) To establish or maintain a picket line of one or more persons with an object of picketing any pier, dock, wharf, landing, or warehouse which is a place of Government operations under this Act, or to engage in picketing any pier, dock, wharf, landing, or warehouse which is a place of Government operations under this Act, the Legislature hereby finding that such picketing constitutes an obstruction to the accomplishment of the purposes of this Act.

(3) To establish or maintain a picket line of one or more persons to picket, or to engage in picketing of, any place where Government operations are or are about to be conducted under this Act, if such picketing interferes or threatens to interfere with such Government operations or with the accomplishments of the purposes of this Act.

(4) For any private employee to engage in a strike or other concerted refusal to transport or otherwise handle any cargo loaded or unloaded or to be loaded or unloaded by the Government pursuant to the provisions of this act, or to perform services on any vessel worked or to be worked by the Government, where an object of any such strike or concerted refusal is (A) to interfere with the conducting of Government operations; or (B) to force or require any person to cease transporting or otherwise handling cargo loaded or unloaded or to be loaded or unloaded by the Government pursuant to the provisions of this act; or (C) to cause loss, injury, or damage to any person by reason of his having transported or otherwise handled or being about to transport or otherwise handle any cargo loaded or unloaded or to be loaded or unloaded by the Government pursuant to the provisions of this act; *Provided however*, That this paragraph shall not, by reason of refusal to return to employment involved in the labor dispute which occasioned the existing public emergency or by reason of refusal to accept employment by the Government, applied to any employee engaged in such labor dispute.

(5) To establish or maintain a picket line of one or more persons or engage in picketing or any other concerted activity with an object of (A) interfering

with the conducting of Government operations; or (B) forcing or requiring any person to cease transporting cargo loaded or unloaded or to be loaded or unloaded by the Government pursuant to the provisions of this act; or (C) causing loss, injury, or damage to any person by reason of his having transported or handled or being about to transport or handle any cargo loaded or unloaded or to be loaded or unloaded by the Government pursuant to the provisions of this act.

The other provisions here relate to picketing. I submit to you, gentlemen, these two acts of the legislature refute any argument that the Territory of Hawaii is infested with the termites known as Communists.

At this time, I would like to thank you, Senator Butler, for the part that you have played in presenting to us the problem of communism within the Territory of Hawaii. You stated in your report that, and I quote—

Communism had a firm grip on the political life of Hawaii and that statehood should not be seriously considered until the people of the islands demonstrate by positive steps a determination to put down the menace of lawless communism.

This was indeed a challenge to us. To meet the challenge, this same group of legislators by resolution requested the House Un-American Activities Committee of the United States Congress to make an investigation of Communist activities in the Territory of Hawaii. In addition, we created our own committee on Un-American Activities. You have just been told by the Honorable Francis Walter that the handful of Communists in the Territory of Hawaii has been smoked out and communism does not constitute a bar to statehood.

The Hawaii State constitutional convention of which I am vice president, upon learning that two of its members were identified as Communists, one admitting that he had been a Communist at one time and the other refusing to state whether he was or is not a Communist at the recent hearing, immediately took steps to remove them, one resigning of his own volition and the other, by an overwhelming vote of 53 to 7, was expelled from the convention.

I would like, therefore, in all sincerity, to submit to this committee and to Senator Butler in particular, that the people of Hawaii have answered in no uncertain terms the challenge of Senator Butler. I submit that we have adequately met the challenge and will continue to do so by direct and positive action. As a State I believe we will be able to deal more effectively with communism. Communism can be most effectively combated only by the highest degree of cooperation between the National and the local government. Such cooperation can only be possible when the local government has adequate and effective representation in the National Government through statehood.

A further argument which has been advanced against statehood for Hawaii is that the large number of American citizens of Japanese ancestry within the islands has not been assimilated. As an American citizen of Chinese ancestry, I would like to answer that charge as I share with the American citizens of Japanese ancestry in all respects, their thoughts, their feelings, their hopes, and their aspirations. I am a product of the American system and the American way of life. Being a product of American institutions, culture, and way of life and having received the benefits of the bountiful blessings of a democratic country, I say without reservation to you American citizens of Caucasian ancestry, that the culture of America is my culture, the history

of America is my history, your feelings, your hopes, and your aspirations are my feelings, my hopes and my aspirations. Mount Vernon, Bunker Hill, the minuteman on Lexington Green, the rude bridge that arched the flood at Concord, and Pearl Harbor, fill me with the same emotions, the same reverence, and the same devotion as they do you. They are just as much a part of me as they are a part of you.

No truer words were ever said by President Roosevelt than these, and I quote, "Americanism is a matter of mind and heart. Americanism is not and never was a matter of race and ancestry." I can say with the greatest of sincerity that the thoughts and feelings I have just expressed are shared by my fellow Americans of Japanese ancestry.

Yesterday, Senator Butler, you stated that you are not opposed to statehood on racial grounds. Since then, my law partner, Mr. Miho, informs me that you have materially aided through scholarships and otherwise, in your State, many citizens of oriental and Negro extraction. I was most happy to hear of your interest in these citizens of oriental and Negro extraction. I will take this back to the people of the Territory of Hawaii. I know that the people of Hawaii, having knowledge of your keen interest in the students of non-Caucasian ancestry, will feel confident that you will give them every consideration in the deliberation of this question of statehood.

The granting of statehood to Hawaii will be, in a political sense, the extension of the Marshall plan to the countries of Asia. Gentlemen, America has poured and has obligated itself to spend billions of dollars in Europe to combat communism and to aid the democracies. The granting of statehood to Hawaii will cost the Federal Government nothing, yet it will accomplish in the world and, especially in the Pacific Basin, what is expected of the costly Marshall plan in Europe, and that is, to win friends for our democratic way of life. The granting of statehood to Hawaii will increase the prestige and honor of the American people in the field of international diplomacy. The principle of self-determination will then be more than a beautiful political philosophy. Domestically, it has been put into action. This will be a resounding assurance to all the world that this great American Nation is sincerely honest in its desire to create a world of self-determining democratic nations. The political philosophy of self-determination will then not be a mere beautiful political philosophy domestically, but it will certainly be a clarion call to the people of the Pacific.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy that we have come here with a large delegation. It is indicative to the Congress of our strong desire for statehood. May I, in behalf of my delegation, thank you and the members of this Senate committee for the courtesies and consideration you have all extended to us. Thank you and mahalo.

Senator TAYLOR. If there are no questions, we thank you very much, Mr. Fong.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Crossley is anxious to leave town and we would appreciate it if you could hear Mr. Crossley briefly at this time.

Senator TAYLOR. All right, Mr. Crossley.

**STATEMENT OF RANDOLPH CROSSLEY, PRESIDENT, HAWAIIAN
FRUIT PACKERS, LTD., HONOLULU, T. H.**

Mr. CROSSLEY. My name is Randolph Crossley. I reside in the island of Kauai. I am a delegate to the constitutional convention now in session in Hawaii, and have served as a member of the house of representatives of the Territorial legislature.

I was born in California in 1904. My father died when I was 15 years old, and I worked my way through high school and college. After traveling extensively in the Pacific, I picked Hawaii as the part of America where I wanted to live and make my business career.

From the time I started a small advertising business in Hawaii in 1929, I have found Hawaii to be a land of opportunity in the best American traditions of free enterprise. I am president of Hawaiian Fruit Packers, Ltd., growers and canners of pineapple doing a gross annual business of nearly \$2,000,000. I am also president of Crossley Associates, Ltd., a commercial flower business started 4 years ago. Last year our flower company did nearly a half million dollars gross in the exportation of orchids and other Hawaiian flowers and foliage.

Permit me to emphasize that I am an independent businessman. I am not allied with, nor do I have any investment in any of the older or larger business in Hawaii. I have found, as I expected to find when I went to Hawaii over 20 years ago, that the islands offer great opportunities for independent business initiative.

My appearance here is most respectfully to urge you to give Hawaii an official status which I am certain is essential to the continued development of the islands as a stable, progressive American community.

Hawaii has been promised statehood for nearly half a century. Many persons, like myself, have gone to Hawaii, and have dedicated our careers to Hawaii, in the confident belief that the rights and privileges of statehood would soon be granted.

Hawaii is now in the extremely difficult phase of postwar adjustment. War disrupted Hawaii's economy far more than it did that of any State. Hawaii's productive economy was severely curtailed by the war, while in most States it was expanded. We are now faced with the urgent need to develop Hawaii to provide work opportunities for our growing population.

I submit that the time for decision as to the status of Hawaii is now. It is my firm conviction that the most constructive step that the Congress of the United States can take to assure progress in Hawaii is to grant immediate statehood.

The current situation is anomalous. We pay more Federal taxes than several of the States. Our total per capital tax load is higher than in all but a few of the States. Yet the only representatives we have in Congress of the United States is a Delegate without a vote. That is taxation without representation.

I am convinced that the dynamic public leadership which Hawaii requires to meet its problems can best be achieved by granting immediate statehood, by permitting the people of Hawaii to choose their own government. Such action would not only strengthen Hawaii, but would go far to advance the cause of American democracy in the entire Pacific world. In keeping with American traditions of fair play and equal justice, the present situation should not be permitted to continue.

I wish to call your attention to what, I think you will agree, is on the face of it, an highly inequitable situation, which I face as an independent businessman in Hawaii. I am a grower and processor of pineapple. I am in competition with another noncontiguous part of America—Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico is exempt from Federal income taxes. It elects its own Governor. But most important, average wages paid in Puerto Rico are about 43 cents an hour, while in Hawaii the average wage in the pineapple industry is \$1.21 an hour.

Now, if there are any reasons why Hawaii cannot be granted statehood soon—and I, at least, do not know of any—then I most strongly recommend that Hawaii be treated at least as equitably as such another noncontiguous part of the United States as Puerto Rico.

Far better, in my opinion, would be to grant Hawaii full statehood now and for that we would expect to continue to pay a full share of the cost of government, which we now do, but without direct representation. Now I am aware that one may argue that if Hawaii is given statehood it will continue to pay full Federal taxes, it will still face the problem of competition with lower wages in such subtropical areas as Puerto Rico. We in Hawaii believe that under the dynamic influence of full local government, with equitable representation in Congress, we can cope with our problems, that we can continue to progress. Hawaii has been able to pay higher wages than comparable island communities in the past because of our initiative and thrift and the exceptional technological development of our agriculture.

Hawaii has for many years striven steadily and consistently to better the lot of all of her people. Comparatively high wages and healthful living conditions are not new in Hawaii. Hawaii has developed a high standard of public education.

One may ask, if Hawaii was able to make such progress under Territorial status before the war, why cannot it continue to progress under Territorial status after the war?

The answer is that with a growing population, with greatly increased costs stemming from unavoidable wartime inflation, with vast changes in both Hawaii and in America as a whole in technology, in finance, in marketing, and other business problems, Hawaii faces far more complex problems than in the past.

I have stressed what to me would be the most important contribution of statehood—the dynamic public leadership which would result from the full rights and privileges of local State government. I am convinced, both from my experience as an independent businessman and as a former member of the Hawaiian Legislature, that this would go far toward helping us to meet our problems and move forward. I do not say this with any thought of criticism of governors or other Federal appointees in Hawaii. The point is that the present appointive system is neither dynamic nor democratic.

But beyond that, in this increasingly complex mass-production society in which we live in America, Hawaii must integrate its economy increasingly with that of continental United States. It is only simple justice that Hawaii should have an official voice in making Federal policy.

I do not urge that Hawaii be granted voting rights in the Congress with any idea of Hawaii's just "getting its share" of Federal benefits. But it is a fact that changes in Federal policy—policy in which Hawaii has no voice—can make or break Hawaii.

Almost everything we do in Hawaii is regulated in some degree by Federal policy. Hawaii is now and has been for nearly a half century competent to have a voice in making Federal policy, not alone in protecting its own interests, but in making a contribution to our National Government.

Hawaii's record in achieving high standards of living, health, and culture are evidence that we have something to offer. Consider education alone. Hawaii maintains 186 public schools, many private schools, and the University of Hawaii. Tests made by the Veterans Administration indicate that locally educated youths are above the average for continental United States in educational attainment. There is intense interest in adult education. Last year, nearly 10,000 adults attended evening courses in a wide range of cultural subjects and crafts.

The people of Hawaii have an outstanding sense of political and civil responsibility. In our recent election of delegates to our constitutional convention, 79 percent of the qualified voters went to the polls. Corrupt machine politics from which a number of mainland areas have suffered in the past, has been unknown in Hawaii. Bloc voting along racial lines is negligible, as the results of the constitutional convention voting clearly show. I am certain that far more bloc voting along lines of racial or national origin is experienced in many parts of continental United States.

Other witnesses before this committee have or will elaborate many of these points, and additional ones. What I have said here has been in an effort to explain briefly the problem as it appears to an independent businessman who has had experience in our local business and political life.

Now, I have a very substantial business in pineapples. We do nearly \$2,000,000 a year in that. I am the smallest company. Also, in the last 4 years we have started a new industry, because we believe any new industry really means the future of the islands, the employment of all of the youngsters who are graduating today, and to help in our economic situation in the islands.

We have started a flower industry. It is only 4 years old, but we have nearly half a million dollars invested in that business, in the exporting of such flowers as you see up here, and the leis that you saw yesterday.

Senator BUTLER. Can you name some few of the other industries where there is promise?

Mr. CROSSLEY. In the fishing industry. There has in the past been one fairly large tuna company. There is one just starting now in the island of Kauai, that will employ many more people on that island. Then there is the industry in fruits, canned guava, and there is a new industry starting now in exporting papaya.

I came before a congressional committee just about a year ago to plead for help on combating the oriental fruitfly. We had splendid cooperation from Mr. Russell's committee, and I am very happy to say that as the result of a lot of that work the situation of the oriental

fruitfly is greatly improved, and papayas are being exported again, and flowers without fumigation; work along that nature.

Senator BUTLER. Is it necessary that the sugar and pineapple industries be developed in these large units that we have now?

That statement has been made here, and I might say frankly that I am of that opinion myself. That is the reason I asked you to name some small industries that might attract new people to the Islands. Is it your opinion that there will be any break-up in this big industry?

Mr. CROSSLEY. Both sugar and pineapple take a large capital investment, and, therefore, it takes substantial tracts of land to support those investments. In my own company, over 15 percent of our production is raised by independent growers, men who have their own small farms, who have really developed a fine security in farming.

Senator BUTLER. Do those small operators have title to their lands?

Mr. CROSSLEY. In every case, they have title to their land.

Senator BUTLER. Is that tendency increasing any, the number of small operators?

Mr. CROSSLEY. Generally speaking, no. In our own case, for instance, it has been a variable between 15 and 20 and 25 percent being perhaps the highest figure.

Senator TAYLOR. The number of independent growers has decreased, has it, in the last few years?

Mr. CROSSLEY. No, I do not believe so, in the last 10 years.

Senator TAYLOR. You said at one time there were 25 percent and now you say there are 15 percent.

Mr. CROSSLEY. That would be our own production; those are our own production figures, and, therefore, there is a smaller percentage of our total.

Senator BUTLER. Other operators handle a percentage of the products; that is, the independents?

Mr. CROSSLEY. On our island one other operator does.

Senator TAYLOR. How have you increased your operation, by buying independent farms or reclaiming land?

Mr. CROSSLEY. Mostly from leasing Government land. If land comes up we all have an opportunity to bid on it. We have bid in competition with a sugar company and have been successful in adding to our holdings in that manner.

Senator TAYLOR. We had fresh Hawaiian pineapple in the Senate restaurant today. It was very fine.

Mr. CROSSLEY. That was through the courtesy of Mr. White of the Hawaiian Pineapple Co. who will testify later. He is president of the largest pineapple company, and I am the president of the smallest, and we are very good friends.

Senator TAYLOR. We have no further questions, Mr. Crossley.

That will conclude the hearings for today, and we will meet again tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 4:10 p. m., an adjournment was taken until 10 a. m., Wednesday, May 3, 1950.)

HAWAII STATEHOOD

WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1950

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:25 a. m., in room 224, Senate Office Building, Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming (chairman), presiding.

Present: Senators O'Mahoney, of Wyoming (chairman), Anderson (New Mexico), Taylor (Idaho), Lehman (New York), Butler (Nebraska), and Cordon (Oregon).

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order, please. Delegate Farrington, your first witness this morning will be the representative of the Grange?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Dr. Sanders has to leave for Europe, and he is going to make a very brief statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Sanders, will you come forward, please.

STATEMENT OF J. T. SANDERS, LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. SANDERS. Senator O'Mahoney and members of the committee, my name is J. T. Sanders, legislative counsel of the National Grange.

The Grange at its eighty-third annual session passed a resolution unqualifiedly approving statehood for Hawaii. Since that time we have had several resolutions from local granges asking us to support statehood for Hawaii.

Nearly 100 years ago Hawaii came into the Union, and asked for statehood immediately. It seems to us that that is entirely too long for a highly developed portion of the United States to live without full rights of citizenship, and we favor statehood for three or four major reasons.

First, we believe that Hawaii and its citizens have proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that they are full American citizens in every sense of the word. The test of their loyalty during the war measured up to any test that we might find demonstrated in this country with our own people.

We think that Hawaii is valuable and should have full rights of statehood because of its great strategical value to our country, and we believe that it should have statehood because it is fully developed agriculturally.

I brought out some of the points of its full development agriculturally in my statement here, but I am not going to read it. I will file this statement, indicating why we think it is developed to this extent.

We believe that Hawaii certainly can meet all financial obligations of a State, and therefore we are in favor of granting Hawaii statehood at this session of Congress. I believe that is about all, Senator, that I have to say.

The CHAIRMAN. How did the Grange happen to come to a conclusion on this matter?

Mr. SANDERS. Well, this matter has been discussed at great lengths in the Grange for several years. As you probably know the Grange did not favor, up until the past year, statehood for noncontiguous portions of the country.

We changed that because we made a very close and intensive study of it during the past session, and, if I recall, we had no dissenting vote on this question in the Grange.

The CHAIRMAN. Where was the vote cast?

Mr. SANDERS. At Sacramento, Calif.

The CHAIRMAN. At a national convention?

Mr. SANDERS. Yes, sir; the eighty-third national convention or session in November of last year.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand you to say that the records of the Grange will show that the problem of statehood for Hawaii has been repeatedly discussed at similar conventions in past years?

Mr. SANDERS. I do not know just how far back, Senator. I know it has for the last three sessions because that is the time that I have been connected with it, and I did not take the trouble to go back beyond that.

The CHAIRMAN. Were these discussions full talks?

Mr. SANDERS. Quite so; yes, sir. The Grange functions largely in committees before we come to the session floor, but even then we had considerable discussions this past year on the floor.

Now previously we did not have very much discussion on the floor of the Grange, but this past year we discussed it at considerable length.

The CHAIRMAN. How did the question happen to arise in the first place?

Mr. SANDERS. Well, I do not know, because the question has been up at least, as I say, for 3 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Grange have membership in Hawaii?

Mr. SANDERS. No, we have no membership in Hawaii. Our California Granges have been somewhat divided on it, but California this year I am sure voted for it. I would have to check that, however. There has been some opposition heretofore in the Western Pacific States. The Grange is a rather peculiar organization, Senator, in that respect.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a very valuable organization, let me say.

Mr. SANDERS. Well, thank you, sir. The Grange quite often adopts its policies along this line. If any individual State or group of States have a very direct interest, I mean seemingly more direct interest than the rest of the States, the rest of the States will likely go along with them unless they have a very, very deep conviction that they are definitely wrong.

The peculiar thing about it is our Western States came around this year on this question, and I do not believe our Western States voted against it at all. I think if you had a poll of the individual masters by a ballot where it was not a matter of expression of the Grange in

respect to certain regional Grange areas, you would have found our organization would be in favor of this by a great majority all along.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there a record vote in the convention?

Mr. SANDERS. Oh, yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you mind filing the return of that vote?

Mr. SANDERS. Oh, no; it would not be possible to do that, Senator. You know we are a fraternal organization. The record is made simply by every person indicating how they vote, and you know how they vote, unless we ask for a secret ballot on it, which we very seldom do.

The CHAIRMAN. The point, of course, which has been raised by this discussion is that while you appear here on behalf of the Grange endorsing statehood, you are unable to state definitely whether or not California at this session endorsed the proposal. Your statement with respect to other States is to some extent indefinite.

You make it quite clear that there has been a change of view, and in view of that it just occurred to me that the position of the Grange in supporting statehood would be very much strengthened if these uncertainties and qualifications were removed.

Therefore I suggest to you that you look over your record and see how definite you can make your statement to the committee that the National Grange has endorsed statehood, and to what extent there is a division of opinion, if any.

Mr. SANDERS. Well, I want to say for the sake of the record that our endorsement of statehood for Hawaii is overwhelming.

We have 72 delegates, and I am quite sure that not over one or two voted against this. Now you rarely get such a vote in the Senate, Senator. If you got a vote like that, you would say that they are very positively in favor of it.

The CHAIRMAN. You would be surprised at the number of bills we pass by unanimous consent.

Mr. SANDERS. We do, too, but that is largely to facilitate things.

The CHAIRMAN. You can see that your testimony will be very much clarified and strengthened if you will, after you leave the stand here, go over your records and write the committee a letter making as definite a statement as you can.

Mr. SANDERS. Well, I will be glad to do that. I am not sure that I could reveal whether the master of California voted favorably or not, or the master of Oregon, because I do not think our regulations would permit us to do that.

Senator ANDERSON. Mr. Sanders, do you think that is important?

Mr. SANDERS. No; I do not, Senator.

Senator ANDERSON. It is your testimony that the Grange is substantially for this?

Mr. SANDERS. I would say that 95 percent of our votes at least were favorable to this, and I think that that has continuously been true.

As I explained—I do not know whether you were in here at that time, Senator Anderson, or not—the Grange has a policy where a regional group has a stand on a thing, and quite often, if it is not very important for the other areas, the grange masters will go along with that region. I think that our stand on the Hawaii question has been largely because of the fact that up until recent years we did not care to go against two of our western masters on this question.

I am not so sure whether Mr. McLane could reflect the viewpoint of the California State master or not. Could you, Mr. McLane?

Mr. McLANE. No; I could not.

Mr. SANDERS. You were out there previous to our coming out there, and I do not know but what you visited there.

Mr. McLANE. We were told in correspondence identified with the Grange that the grange master of California had opposed statehood for Hawaii for many years because of the Japanese in California, but he felt that the Japanese in California no longer constituted a menace, as he put it, to the agriculture of California or national defense, and therefore withdrew his objections.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me say that the witness, in his own voluntary statement, called attention to the qualifications of his statement. He told the committee that for years the Grange was opposed to statehood for noncontiguous areas. This year the Grange has changed its position.

He told us that western representation in the Grange in the past was to some extent at least opposed to statehood; that in California there was opposition.

He was unable to state whether or not California at this last convention had changed its position. All of these were ambiguities and uncertainties in the position of the Grange, which the witness himself brought out. I am giving him the opportunity of going over his record and filing a definite statement with the committee which will show clearly, so that there will be no doubt or qualifications, as to just what the position of the Grange and its various elements may be.

Senator ANDERSON. As a member of the Grange, I want to get into this. Is there the slightest ambiguity in the position of the Grange on this question?

Mr. SANDERS. Not at all now, Senator.

Senator ANDERSON. Is there the slightest doubt on what the position of the Grange is for statehood?

Mr. SANDERS. No; nor uncertainty.

I would say this; that granting there is an uncertainty and ambiguity there, it is a very small ambiguity and uncertainty that the Senator has brought out here, because I am quite sure that this is the case. The Grange is overwhelmingly, and has been master to master, in favor of this thing.

If you had had a vote that was not as I explained it, where certain areas had a very pronounced view on the question and the other masters do not want to make a strong issue of it, they will be right along and not say much about it, especially if the decision is made in committees and is not brought to the floor. That is the way these decisions have been made mostly, because the Pacific coast people were always on those committees previously.

The CHAIRMAN. I still extend to you the opportunity of making your statement more definite and certain, as the lawyers would say.

Mr. SANDERS. Well, sir, I will write a more certain letter if I can, but I really do not think that I could. I tried to make my statement that I think it is overwhelmingly favorable, and I am sure that that is the case. I am sure that we do not have any vigorous opposition from the Pacific Coast any more on this thing.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, sir. Do you want to leave your prepared statement for the record?

Mr. SANDERS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Sanders. Your prepared statement will be incorporated in the record at this point.

(The prepared statement of Mr. J. T. Sanders above referred to follows:)

1. My names it J. T. Sanders and I am the legislative counsel of the National Grange. I appear for the Grange in favor of granting statehood to the Hawaiian Islands. About a week ago I presented a statement to this committee in support of statehood for Alaska. It seems to us that a strong case could be made out for statehood for Alaska; and we feel that equally as strong a case can be made out for Hawaii.

2. The Eighty-third annual session of the National Grange at Sacramento, Calif., last November passed a resolution favoring without any qualification the admission of Hawaii as a State. We sincerely hope you will report favorably on H. R. 49 at an early date and that it is brought to the Senate floor in time to pass during the present session.

3. Hawaii came into our Nation voluntarily 52 years ago. Prior to that and frequently since then this Territory of the United States with at present over a half million people, 85 percent of whom are citizens, have requested to be given States' rights and full citizenship.

4. If there ever was any doubt in the mind of anyone that the people of Hawaii were American citizens in the truest and fullest extent, it seems to us that such doubts should have been entirely dispelled after Pearl Harbor. Its people gave as fully and as freely of their substance and their lives as any equal number of Americans. Probably no equal amount of land and number of people of our Nation exceeded Hawaii in total service rendered to the Nation during the war. This maximum service springs both from its extreme strategical value and from the full loyalty of its citizens.

5. We favor the admission of Hawaii into the Union since, if the people of any previous territory have demonstrated their fitness and worthiness to become full-fledged citizens, it seems to us Hawaiians have done so. As far back as 1854—nearly 100 years ago—the people of Hawaii asked to be admitted to the United States as a State. Two years after annexation the Federal Government developed an organic act for the people of Hawaii. This organic act—or State constitution—for Hawaii has been considered as an ample promise of statehood. It seems to us they have acquitted themselves in a manner worthy of full citizenship ever since. We believe for this reason alone their request should be given great weight.

6. But their great strategical importance and the strength that statehood will lend to this strategical worth is also an important reason for admitting them to statehood. These are critical days and years in our Nation's history. We need all the strength that we can get from such important outposts of our Nation as Hawaii is. It seems to us that the great demonstration of the strategical importance of Hawaii which the recent war has given us should make us anxious and ready to grant Hawaii its statehood at the earliest practicable time.

7. The advance development of both agriculture and industry in Hawaii should also make it desirable to admit it to statehood. Few States can boast of as highly developed agriculture as Hawaii today, to say nothing of the stage of agricultural development when these other States were admitted to the Union. Naturally, this is the phase of Hawaii in which the Grange is most interested.

8. Lacking all natural resources except the soil itself, the people of Hawaii have had to build their economy wholly on an agricultural foundation. Some idea of the remarkable strides they have made within their limits can be gained by examining what they have done with what they have.

9. The Hawaiian Islands have a total land area of 4,099,840 acres. A very large part of this is mountainous, semiarid or covered with lava flows. Twenty-six percent of the land is devoted to forest reserves, 42 percent to beef and sheep ranges and another significant part to cities, roads, and military establishments. Only 7 percent is available for crop cultivation.

10. Yet on this small area, comprising less than 300,000 acres, Hawaii has developed what is perhaps the most prosperous economy of any Territory in the history of the United States.

11. This has been made possible by the application of intelligent and far-seeing methods—intensive use of the land, the cultivation of high revenue-yielding

crops and, above all, the use of scientific practices. Hawaii farming ranks today as one of the world's most highly mechanized agricultural areas.

12. Today, Hawaii ranks as one of the world's foremost sugar producers. One-seventh of the sugar consumed in the United States comes from Hawaiian farms. Last year, Hawaii produced close to 1,000,000 tons, valued at about \$100,000,000.

13. A revealing fact is that while production has, generally been steadily upward, the acreage has been downward. The average cane yield per acre has increased from about 41 tons in 1920 to over 75 tons today.

14. Hawaii's second largest industry is the production of pineapples. Like sugar, this industry had a small beginning. The first commercial pineapple pack was produced less than 50 years ago, in 1903. The output for that year was less than 2,000 cases. Today, the industry produces the major part of the world's supply. In 1948, the latest year for which figures are available, Hawaii produced nearly 18½ million cases, valued at about \$75,000,000. The industry can now produce in an hour the 1903 output.

15. In addition to canned, frozen, and fresh pineapple products, the industry has developed many byproducts such as citric acid, bran, alcohol, carbon dioxide gas, and natural sugar.

16. Along with sugar and pineapple, Hawaii also produces a wide and increasing variety of other farm products. The wholesale value of these other products amounted to about \$31,000,000 in 1948.

17. It comes as a surprise to many that Hawaii has a sizable cattle industry. The cattle and poultry industries together account for about \$21,000,000 of the 1948 value of farm products.

18. In closing we would like to reiterate our previous statement that we give our wholehearted support of statehood for the people and Territory of Hawaii. We believe its people have for many years continuously demonstrated their worthiness to become a State. Especially did they do this during the recent war. Likewise strategical reasons dictate that Hawaii should be given statehood. Especially its great agricultural development and its industrial development as well as its half million people set it out as being far ahead of most States in these respects when they were admitted to statehood. We know of no good reason why Hawaii should not forthwith be admitted to statehood; and strongly recommend that this be done during the current session of Congress.

(The following letter was subsequently received from the National Grange:)

NATIONAL GRANGE,

Washington 6, D. C., May 12, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I understand that you would like to have the action of the National Grange with reference to statehood for Hawaii. At its last session held in November 1949 at Sacramento, Calif., it passed the following resolution: "Resolved, That the National Grange favor statehood for Alaska and Hawaii."

This is recorded on page 190 of the journal of proceedings.

Yours sincerely,

A. S. Goss,

Master, the National Grange.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM H. HEEN, MEMBER, TERRITORIAL SENATE AND MEMBER OF STATE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION AND COCHAIRMAN, HAWAII LEGISLATIVE HOLDOVER COMMITTEE OF 1949

MR. HEEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee:

First, may I say a few words concerning my background. I am of Hawaiian-Chinese parentage and an American citizen under the provisions of the Hawaiian Organic Act; educated in private schools of Hawaii and studied law on the mainland of the United States. In private life, I am a practicing lawyer; in public life, I am a member of the Territorial senate and have been such during the past 24 years. I am also, at present, a delegate to the constitutional convention which

is now holding sessions in Honolulu to draft a constitution for the State of Hawaii and in that convention I am the chairman of the committee on legislative powers and functions. Before embarking upon my career as a legislator, I served in the executive and judicial branches of government—city and county attorney, deputy attorney general, and in 1917 I was appointed a judge of the First Circuit Court of the Territory of Hawaii, a court of record, which appointment was confirmed by the United States Senate. In politics, I am a Democrat—not by birth but by choice.

The CHAIRMAN. I like the emphasis which you put on that.

Mr. HEEN. Perhaps you would like this, too. Upon reaching the age of political maturity, I was able to distinguish right from wrong, and I chose to be a Democrat.

Senator ANDERSON. It is not that simple a choice for most of us.

Mr. HEEN. I do not purpose, at this time, to make any statement concerning the grounds upon which Hawaii claims its right to become a State. Others who have already spoken and others who will speak later have and will cover those grounds adequately.

I wish to address myself to the question of the public lands of Hawaii. It is a paramount question, next in importance to statehood itself, and is of vital concern to the people of Hawaii.

The title to the public lands of Hawaii was acquired by the United States by two instruments, the first being the cession of the lands made by the Republic of Hawaii and the second being the Newlands resolutions accepting the cession. By these instruments the public lands of Hawaii were ceded to and accepted by the United States subject to a special trust for the benefit of the inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands. This appears from the basic documents, as follows:

Article II of the Treaty of Annexation of 1897, ratified by the Senate of the Republic of Hawaii on September 9, 1897, and accepted by the Newlands resolution of July 7, 1898, contained the following proviso:

Provided, That all revenue from or proceeds of the same, except as regards such part thereof as may be used or occupied for the civil, military, or naval purposes of the United States, or may be assigned for the use of the local government, shall be used solely for the benefit of the inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands for educational and other public purposes.

While the cession made by the Republic of Hawaii transferred to the United States the absolute fee of the public domain, the effect of this proviso, contained verbatim in the Newlands resolution accepting the cession, was "to subject the public lands in Hawaii to a special trust, limiting the revenue from or proceeds of the same to the uses of the inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands." This special trust was so recognized in an opinion of the Attorney General of September 9, 1899, the opinion also holding that upon the cession the Hawaiian government ceased to have the power of disposition of the lands until the same was provided for by laws of Congress.

Thus Congress, while having exclusive legislative power over the public lands in Hawaii, accepted those lands on a special trust for the benefit of the inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands. The result was to constitute the United States as the Government of the people of the Territory, the transferee of the lands ceded. The cession was not made to the National Government for the benefit of the whole people of the United States.

Senator ANDERSON. Could you tell us, in the proviso that you quote, "That all revenue from or proceeds of the same," what does "same" refer to?

Mr. HEEN. The lands, the public lands, from the part that goes before that proviso. It is in the resolution itself.

The situation in Hawaii is the same as in the case of Texas, both of which were sovereign nations at the time of their annexation. Since Texas was admitted to immediate statehood the cession of the public domain was made by the Republic of Texas to the State of Texas, while in the case of Hawaii, coming in as a Territory which at the time of the cession was not even organized, the cession necessarily was made to the United States in its capacity as the Government of the people of the Territory.

In the case of Texas the United States did not assume the public debt, while in the case of Hawaii it did assume the public debt in the amount of \$4,000,000. However, the United States received consideration for this assumption of the public debt of Hawaii through the provision contained in the terms of the cession, that the United States might take, for the use of the National Government, without compensation, any part of the public lands of Hawaii. This right has been exercised many times and has continued over a 50-year period. As a result, the United States holds, as of the beginning of 1950, approximately 174,500 acres transferred to its use from the public lands of Hawaii. Under H. R. 49 these lands, having a value in excess of \$108,500,000, present value, will be retained by the Federal Government. Slightly less than one-third of this value, or \$38,500,000, represents lands taken between 1900 and 1950, so that, if the lands reserved for Federal use had been frozen as of the date of the cession, as in the case of Texas, the Federal Government would not have received this valuable consideration. The \$4,000,000 debt assumed does not warrant still further additions to the Federal holdings. In the case of Puerto Rico this right to make free use of public lands for purposes of the National Government was relinquished after only 4½ years as contrasted with 50 years' enjoyment thereof in the case of Hawaii.

When the Territorial government was organized by the Hawaiian Organic Act, Congress itself recognized that the public lands in Hawaii had been transferred to it in its capacity as the government of the Territory, Congress placing this property "in the possession, use, and control" of the newly organized Territorial government. Congress further recognized that the people of Hawaii are entitled to the revenues from the public lands by providing, through an amendment of section 91 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, that if lands taken for United States use were devoted to revenue-producing leases, such revenues should be covered into the treasury of the Territory of Hawaii.

Were the United States now to take the position that upon admission to statehood Hawaii is entitled only to the land grants usually made to new States, this would be upon the assumption that the public lands in Hawaii are held as a part of the public domain of the whole people of the United States, which it is submitted is not the case. The lands were not ceded as such and never have been administered as such.

In short, the people of Hawaii are the real owners of the public lands, the Federal Government having only the bare naked legal title to those lands. All the incidents of complete ownership are there—the right of possession, the right of user, the right to lease, sell, and otherwise dispose of those lands and the right to use the proceeds or revenues derived therefrom for public purposes.

Referring to the public debt of \$4,000,000 assumed by the United States—that is a trifling amount when you compare it with the millions of dollars the people of Hawaii have paid into the National Treasury by way of taxes and other revenue. In the short period of 4 years alone—1944 through 1947—they paid over one-half billion dollars.

In urging that the inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands are the true owners of the public lands, the only purpose I have in mind is that the records of these hearings show that we have not waived our right to assert this claim of ownership before the joint committee composed of the members of Committees on Public Lands of the Senate and the House of Representatives when it takes up the investigation of the question of public lands as provided for in H. R. 49. It is my firm conviction that, when this question is thoroughly explored before that joint committee, we will be able to demonstrate that our claim of ownership is fair, equitable, and just.

We do not ask for a determination of this question at this time. A prolonged investigation of this question now would only serve to delay final action on H. R. 49. With certain minor amendments, we are satisfied with the provisions of H. R. 49 which deal with the public lands.

May I take advantage of this opportunity to express, on behalf of the people of Hawaii, their sincere gratitude and aloha for what the President, the Secretary of the Interior and his able assistants, and the many others in high office have done in advancing immediate statehood for Hawaii.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Heen. Are there any questions?

Senator CORDON. One question only. What is the total area of the public lands of Hawaii with respect to which you just made the statement, that is the portion remaining after certain portions have been dedicated to either public use of the Federal Government or public use of the Hawaiian Territorial government or subdivision thereof.

Mr. HEEN. I do not know the exact areas, but we did bring with us Colin G. Lennox, president of the Territorial board of agriculture and forestry, and he will appear before this committee as an expert upon that particular question.

Senator CORDON. You have appeared then, Senator, chiefly from the standpoint of one having knowledge of the legal aspects of the picture?

Mr. HEEN. That is right.

Senator CORDON. I shall be happy to take the matter up with him. Thank you.

Senator TAYLOR. Senator Heen, there has been some discussion here of the question of communism in the Hawaiian Islands. There has been the charge that the Democratic Party in Hawaii has been infiltrated, and even the implication has been made that it has been taken

over by Communists possibly. Being a Democrat, you could probably enlighten us on that. Would you care to do so?

Mr. HEEN. Personally I do not think they are going to make very much trouble so far as the voting population is concerned. The voters in Hawaii are intelligent, and while they may have been misled in one election, that is in the election of 1946 when those who have been charged with being Communists were able to elect quite a number of members to the house of representatives, but after that they have not been so successful.

I know in the election of 1946, I ran for reelection to the Territorial senate, there was also a Republican colleague of mine who was running for reelection to the senate, and before the primary election, he had the endorsement of the PAC, the political action committee, that was supposed to be affiliated with the Communist group there. His friends were very much elated because of this endorsement.

When the primaries came along, why, he got the lowest vote among the three Republican candidates. In other words, those who had supported him in the past, the Republicans, repudiated his candidacy because of this endorsement.

I did not get that endorsement. I was not nominated, and in the final election, or rather just prior to that, this Republican colleague of mine repudiated the endorsement that he got from the PAC, and as a result of that the PAC repudiated him as a candidate in the general election, and he did not get back the old support that he had. He lost out altogether and was eliminated, which shows you the high intelligence of the population there when it comes to voting, so I have no particular worry about this infiltration on the part of these Communists in Hawaii so far as the Democratic Party is concerned.

I have never received the support of the PAC or the sympathizers of the Communist Party, not one time, but nevertheless I have been elected and reelected time and time again, mind you, as a Democratic candidate.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Anderson, do you have any questions?
Senator ANDERSON. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Heen, may I call your attention to page 3 of your statement in which you discuss in more detail the question of the use of the public lands, and you make the statement that "The Government of the United States has taken over for the use of the National Government land of the value of \$38,500,000 between 1900 and 1950." Do you intend to imply that any of that taking was beyond the terms of article II of the treaty of annexation?

Mr. HEEN. No; I do not imply that at all. They had the right through Executive orders of the President or of the Government to take such lands as were needed for the National Government.

Much of these lands were taken between 1898 and 1900, that is between the date of the annexation and the date when the Territory became an organized Territory under the terms of the Hawaiian Organic Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Article II of the treaty of annexation, which you quoted, provided that revenue from the proceeds of all of these public lands "except such part thereof as may be used or occupied for the civil, military, or naval purposes of the United States or may be as-

signed for the use of the local government"—that language is clear and explicit so far as the right of the United States to take parts of the public domain for civil, military, or naval purposes of the United States is concerned, and for the use of the local government. Has any of this land ever been taken for any purpose of the United States beyond that?

Mr. HEEN. Beyond what?

The CHAIRMAN. Civil, military, or naval purposes.

Mr. HEEN. I do not think so. It was taken for instance for the national park, Kilauea, the great national park there. That was done I think by an act of Congress rather than by an Executive order of the President, and there were lands set aside for naval bases and reservations.

The CHAIRMAN. You raise no question of the legitimacy of that action?

Mr. HEEN. That is no question at all, Mr. Chairman, concerning the fact that the lands which were turned over for the use of the United States Government under the terms of this bill will remain the property of the United States. Likewise what has been set aside for the use of the Territorial government and the political subdivisions of the Territory will remain with the Territory and those civil subdivisions.

The CHAIRMAN. You say here on page 3:

slightly less than one-third of this value of \$38,500,000 represents lands taken between 1900 and 1950, so that if the lands reserved for Federal use had been frozen as of the date of the cession as in the case of Texas, the Federal Government would not have received this valuable consideration.

It is your contention that this assignment for civil, military, or naval purposes, made in compliance with article II of the treaty of annexation, was not justified?

Mr. HEEN. No. It was justified. Now, if we had come into the United States as a State at the time of the cession like Texas, immediate statehood at that time, then the question would have been different altogether.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you make any suggestion that there should be some compensation to Hawaii for that land?

Mr. HEEN. No, no. My point is this, Mr. Chairman. That as to the remaining lands which have not been set aside for the National Government, not set aside for the Territorial government, as to those remaining lands I believe that we are entitled to them because they are being held only in trust by the United States for the use and benefit of the people of Hawaii, so that when the status of the Territory changes to that of a State, what will become of those remaining lands? I say that they should be turned over to the State of Hawaii.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you include in that category the lands which have been assigned to the national park?

Mr. HEEN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean merely those lands which have not as yet been used in accordance with the Treaty of Annexation?

Mr. HEEN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. Thank you very much, sir.

Senator Tsukiyama.

STATEMENT OF WILFRED C. TSUKIYAMA, PRESIDENT OF THE TERRITORIAL SENATE

Mr. TSUKIYAMA. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have no written statement for you today. On a question so important as that of statehood, I prefer to speak today from the depths of my heart rather than from a script.

On account of the importance of my position as president of the Territorial senate, and on account of my ancestral background, I should like to go a little more exhaustively into personal history than the witnesses who have preceded me.

My name is Wilfred C. Tsukiyama. Like Senator Heen, who preceded me, because I was born in Honolulu prior to the date when the organic act was granted to Hawaii. I was born not a citizen of the United States; but, by virtue of the organic act, like Senator Heen, I was made a citizen of the United States.

My parents came to Hawaii in the late eighties, as contract laborers on the plantation. After completing my elementary and high-school education in the public schools of the Territory, the First World War broke out. I still had one more month to go in my senior year in high school, but, with parental consent, which was necessary on account of my minority, I became a member of the United States Army and served for almost a year and a half.

Upon receiving my honorable discharge, I decided that I should continue higher education so I left Honolulu and matriculated at Coe College in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, where I took my liberal-arts course. I then went to the University of Chicago, and in 1924 completed my course in law.

Upon returning to Hawaii, and after passing the bar examination, I became associated in the practice of law with Gov. Ingram M. Stainback, and with Samuel B. Kemp, the present chief justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii.

In 1929 I was fortunate to have been appointed by the then city and county attorney of Honolulu as one of his deputies. In 1932, as a result of the change in the law which made the city and county attorney's office appointive rather than elective, in accordance with the recommendation then made by Mr. Seth Richardson, the then mayor, George Fred Wright elevated me from a deputyship to that of chief city and county attorney of Honolulu.

I continuously occupied that position until the end of 1940, when I left Government service to engage in the private practice of law. During the war, as the members of this committee will recall, up to 1942, persons of Japanese ancestry were not allowed to become soldiers. I believe it was March 1942 when the restriction was lifted.

Without waiting for induction, despite my age at the time, I was the first person of Japanese ancestry who filed my application for military service. Probably the authorities felt that I was verging on senility, and I was not taken.

However, I believe that I did as much as any person could have done in participating in the war effort on the home front. I was an officer of the Office of Civilian Defense. I was also an officer of the Office of Price Administration. I was a member of the Selective Service Board. I say in all humility, gentlemen, that I am the proud pos-

essor of a certificate of commendation signed by the President of the United States.

Last year I was honored by my alma mater, Coe College, with an honorary doctorate, and significantly one of the cohonorees at that commencement happened to be Senator Margaret Chase Smith.

After receiving my doctorate, I made a short visit to Washington and had the honor and pleasure of meeting several of the Senators, including Senator Butler, and much to my surprise when I returned to Honolulu, on the same day, I received a beautiful certificate from the Governor of Nebraska appointing me admiral of the great State of Nebraska, and I discovered that that distinction was conferred upon me by that great State through the recommendation of Senator Butler.

In 1946, in one of my weak moments, I decided to enter into politics at the request of a large number of my friends, most of whom, by the way, were of Caucasian background. I finally made my mind up to run for the Territorial senate. I was fortunate enough to have been elected, and that was the same election of 1946 to which Senator Heen referred.

I was not endorsed by the PAC; but, notwithstanding, I was successful in the election. I held the important position of chairman of the judiciary committee during the first session of my term in 1947. In 1949, when the next regular session came along, there was considerable discussion and deliberation as to who should be elected president of the senate.

May I assure you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that I had neither ambition nor aspiration to become president of the Territorial senate. My colleagues elected me to that office, and in so doing they practically forced me to accept that high office, and in that connection may I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the Territorial senate is composed of 15 members.

Eight of these members are Caucasians of whole blood; three of them are Caucasians of mixed Hawaiian and Caucasian blood; one of them is a Chinese of whole blood. Senator Heen is a person of mixed Chinese and Hawaiian blood. One other Senator outside of myself is a person who is a Japanese of full blood.

The first Senator who indicated to me that there was a sentiment to have me serve as president of the senate was of Caucasian ancestry, and the others followed. I mention that fact, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, to demonstrate to you that when a person, regardless of race, color, or creed, is elevated to any position in Hawaii, it is not the result of any racial heritage or racial bloc.

My predecessors have already made comprehensive and exhaustive presentations on the political, economic, and social developments of the Territory of Hawaii, and I can scarcely say anything that will not savor in some degree of repetition. I shall endeavor to be brief and confine myself to a couple or three points upon which the opposition has heretofore relied in impeding and denying statehood for Hawaii.

One, the heterogeneous composition of the population of Hawaii, and more particularly the alleged doubtful loyalty of the persons of Japanese ancestry.

Second, the noncontiguity of Hawaii to continental United States.

I sincerely believe, Mr. Chairman, that the first argument has been amply refuted and the doubt solved, for as testified to by previous

witnesses, prior to and during the last war, on the home front there was not a single trace of sabotage or fifth-column activity even among the 170,000 people of Japanese antecedents.

Again, on the home front, practically every man, woman, and child of every race, nationality, and creed performed their part in the war effort, oversubscribing every quota of the war-bond issue and participating directly and indirectly in the manifold activities of the Office of Civilian Defense, of the Office of Price Administration, the Red Cross, and the blood bank.

Now, on the battle front the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion and the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team distinguished themselves by countless deeds of valor and heroism, including the famous rescue of the "lost battalion."

If memory serves me correctly, the record—the enviable record—of those boys includes 5 presidential citations, 1 Meritorious Service Plaque, 65 Distinguished Service Crosses, 290 Silver Stars, 782 Bronze Stars, over 100 Purple Hearts, 50 Army commendations, and 82 division commendations.

In 1937 when the joint congressional committee was making an on-the-spot statehood investigation in Honolulu, of which Chairman O'Mahoney was a member, I had the honor of testifying, and in doing so among other things I alluded to the military service of persons of Japanese ancestry of Hawaii in World War I, and expressed my confidence that the same element of the population would be true and loyal in time of war as well as in time of peace.

Because of that statement, I was severely and relentlessly ridiculed by a weekly publication then known as the Hawaii Sentinel, which referred to my statement as specious if not facetious, on the ground that military service in World War I was no criteria because in that war Japan was an ally of the United States. Today, Mr. Chairman, I have the glorious satisfaction that my prediction was not erroneous.

I come now, Mr. Chairman, to the second argument: That of non-contiguity. It appears rather unfortunate and singular to me that that argument should still persist. What happened during the recent war and what has happened since that time has clearly demonstrated that we have conquered distance.

Distance proved no impediment to the quick recovery of Hawaii after the disaster of December 7. The ever-improving means of transportation and communication has brought Hawaii closer to Washington than Boston was in the early history of this country. Today you can take a midnight snack in New York and enjoy a sumptuous Hawaiian luau or feast for dinner the next evening.

I have often wondered, Mr. Chairman, what the opposition really means by noncontiguity. Do they refer to the situation where one piece of terra firma is separated from another by water? If so, let me say this, not as a bit of pleasantry but in all seriousness.

Two-thirds of continental United States is separated from the remaining one-third by the mighty Mississippi River. Most of the Territories lying west of the Mississippi were admitted into the Union as States at a time when the Nation was striving to make improvements upon Robert Fulton's steamboat, the *Clermont*, which had just made its first voyage from East River to Albany, a distance of only 143 miles, in 32 hours.

The locomotive, too, was then at its primitive stage. It was not until 1829 that Peter Cooper completed his work on his locomotive called the Tom Thumb. It is interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, in perusing the Congressional Record, that the forces in the Congress that opposed statehood for those Territory lying west of the Mississippi had advanced the same argument of distance, of remoteness.

I say to you in all sincerity, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of this committee, who is there today who would dare say that those Territories west of the Mississippi should not have been admitted into the Union as States?

In connection with my receiving the distinction of admiral of the great navy of the State of Nebraska, I became tremendously interested in that State, Senator Butler, and so I began to read about Nebraska. It seemed quite significant and interesting to me that in 1860, when the Legislature of Nebraska submitted the question of statehood to the people of Nebraska, the majority of the Nebraskans voted against statehood. In 1864 the Legislature of Nebraska bypassed the people and petitioned the Congress for an enabling act. The Congress granted that enabling act.

Back in Nebraska there was called a constitutional convention. Because the delegates of that convention were opposed to statehood, the convention adjourned sine die.

In 1866 the Congress again passed an enabling act. Because of the attitude of the people of Nebraska the legislature drew up its own constitution, as I understand it, and submitted it to the people for their approval. This time the people of Nebraska did approve the constitution, but when it came back to the Congress the Congress passed an act to admit the Territory into the Union, but President Andrew Johnson vetoed the measure on the ground that if Nebraska became a State it would bolster the then Republican Senate by two more Republican Senators from Nebraska.

However, finally after a second attempt, the Congress overrode the President's veto, and President Johnson had no alternative but to declare that Nebraska had become a State.

Alluding now, Mr. Chairman, to your reference yesterday to the problem of dual citizenship, which was considered quite significant in 1937 during the investigation then made by the joint congressional committee, I should like to state that since that time so many have taken advantage of the expatriation law of Japan that today about 95 to 96 percent of the persons of Japanese ancestry have become expatriated.

This nebulous thing that is called dual citizenship is a product, as you know, of a conflict between the citizenship law of the United States and the law of Japan and many countries in Europe. Here we make the place of birth the basis of citizenship, while Japan makes parentage the basis of citizenship.

The procedure involving expatriation was so cumbersome that the leaders in Honolulu, after launching a campaign for expatriation, collected more than 20,000 signatures to a petition asking Congress and the State Department to enter into some negotiation with Japan so that there might be a wholesale expatriation under law, but we were told, Mr. Chairman, that because of the diplomatic complexities it would be difficult to enter into such a negotiation with Japan at that time.

I should like to touch upon just one more point. It has also been urged by the opposition that the granting of statehood to Hawaii would be setting a dangerous precedent in that it might lead other noncontiguous islands and even foreign countries applying for the same status. I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that argument is untenable because obviously it is fallacious.

In granting statehood to Hawaii in fulfillment of a moral obligation, it does not set the kind of precedent that is apprehended as dangerous. When the Congress granted the organic act to Hawaii and made it an incorporated Territory of the United States, the Congress promised inferentially that Hawaii would ultimately be made a State, and a Territory is but an inchoate state, in the words of the court in *Ex parte Morgan*, found I believe in 20 Federal 298.

In the final analysis, Mr. Chairman, the people of Hawaii are merely asking for fair play. They are earnestly pleading with the Congress to keep faith. They have the same aspiration for self-government as all Americans do.

In paying one hundred millions of dollars into the Federal Treasury, we sincerely believe that we are entitled to full representation in the Federal Government. Ever since the annexation and incorporation of the Territory, the people of Hawaii have been keenly interested in the national and international affairs of this Nation.

I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that the people of Hawaii, because of the peculiar set-up of that land, have made a more intensive study of the geography and history of this country, to know more about it, than many of the people on the mainland who are prone to take things for granted.

Historically, Mr. Chairman, we remember that one of the greatest thrills in the history of this land is that in 1620, a band of about 100 Pilgrims, after leaving the treacherous waters of the Atlantic for over 60 days, landed upon Plymouth Rock.

On that day was planted the seed which was destined to bring forth into this world a mighty new nation, and in the words of Abraham Lincoln, a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

We vividly remember the hardships that were endured by those Pilgrims to make their freedom secure. We recount with inspiration, Mr. Chairman, the day of the Thirteen Colonies and their struggle for independence.

We picture the Civil War, we picture the great westward movement of the dauntless American pioneers through the dangers that lurked along the Santa Fe Trail and the caravans of covered wagons slowly blazing their way up the Oregon Trail to the Northwest Territory through blizzards, sagebrush, and cactus.

We thrill as you do, Mr. Chairman, to such names as Jefferson, Franklin, Nathan Hale, Jackson, Lincoln, General Custer, and many hundreds of others. Democracy, Mr. Chairman, the American way of life, has come down to us as a priceless heritage, the fruit of three centuries of struggle.

In all of these things and in all the things that have made this Nation a great democracy, we of Hawaii want to share more realistically and more intimately as a State and not as a governmental orphan; and when Hawaii takes its proper place in the constellation of States.

I say with the utmost sincerity that the rest of the Nation shall not find Hawaii wanting in any of the attributes that combine to perpetuate the eternalize the solidarity of this great Nation, the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, may I thank you from the bottom of my heart for this honor and privilege and your kind attention.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Tsukiyama, I am sure that the committee feels as I feel, that your presentation has been a very moving and persuasive one.

We feel very happy, indeed, that under the flag of the United States there should have risen to prominence in public affairs of the Territory of Hawaii a man of your ancestry who was so thoroughly grounded in the basic principles of Americanism, which, after all, are the basic principles of freedom all the world over.

Mr. TSUKIYAMA. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add just a word to that. I do not know exactly why he happened to get his education in the Midwest, but we are glad that you did, and I do not know that you had any advantage over those who may not have had that privilege, but I do not think it hurt you any.

Mr. TSUKIYAMA. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Sinclair.

STATEMENT OF DR. GREGG M. SINCLAIR, PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII, HONOLULU, T. H.

Dr. SINCLAIR. I will try to be as brief as possible. I think in addition to Senator Tsukiyama's remarks regarding Nebraska, he could say that Senator Butler, when he wanted a new president of Doane College, took my predecessor, David L. Crawford.

My name is Gregg M. Sinclair, president of the University of Hawaii. I went to Hawaii in 1928 and I have been president since 1942.

I should like to mention three points only regarding Hawaiian education and the readiness of our people to qualify for statehood. I do not pose as an expert on the public-school system, but Dean Bruce White and Dr. Everly of Teachers College, University of Hawaii, made up these statistics which I should like to submit for the record to show Hawaii's place in the whole American scheme of things, for example, the per capita cost per pupil in Hawaii and in the mainland.

It might interest you to know that in Hawaii we spend \$199.25, the national median is \$178, and in this particular item Hawaii exceeds 33 States in its expenditure per pupil.

The average annual salary for teachers in Hawaii is \$3,320, and the national median is \$2,440. We exceed 45 States.

There are 19 such statistics that I should like to submit for the record. I might say we have 187 schools, public schools, in Hawaii, with an enrollment of 85,000. There are 3,583 teachers and the teacher-pupil ratio is 1 to 32. We are trying to reduce it to 1 to 30, perhaps we will sometime, but 1 to 32 is a rather good average, we think.

The legislature has always been generous and appreciative of the work of the public schools. The current year 1949-50 the total expenditures will be over \$16,000,000. I think all through the years the

legislators have tried to have a good system of education, not because we want to qualify for statehood, but because it is the American tradition. We want intelligent educated people.

Therefore we say that in these different statistics, you will find that Hawaii does not range last in any of them except in one particular thing, and that is in the number of one-room schoolhouses. We have gone in for consolidated schools more than one-room schoolhouses. Forty-eight States exceed Hawaii in the number of one-room schoolhouses. The percent of high schools enrolling less than 300 pupils in Hawaii is 5.8, the national median is 43 percent, and 45 States have a larger number, but in the high schools enrolling over 300, which I think is the real issue, because that is where we concentrate, Hawaii is 76 percent and the national median is 17 percent. The number of States that Hawaii exceeds is 47.

I think, in the preparation of teachers, Hawaii has done its best work. The university initiated for the whole country the 5-year system of teacher preparation not merely for high schools but for elementary schools. The percent of teachers holding bachelor or higher degrees in Hawaii is 71 percent. The national median is 59 percent. We exceed 40 States in that particular thing.

For those teachers holding master's degrees or equivalents, Hawaii has 39 percent, the national median is 14 and we exceed 47.

Hawaii requires 5 years of college training for elementary state teacher's certificates. No other State in the Union requires that for elementary schools. Seventeen States have 4-year requirements, three have 3 years, thirteen have 2 years, and nine have 1 year, but we exceed all the States of the Union in the requirements of teachers for elementary schools.

Now in the requirements of college training for high-school teachers, Hawaii, as I say, requires 5 years. There is no difference in requirements between high school and elementary school. There are only three States in the Union that require 5 years' preparation for teaching in high schools. These figures, by the way, were taken from the sources that I shall give you, all government sources.

The CHAIRMAN. When you speak of government are you speaking of the Territorial government or the Federal Government?

Dr. SINCLAIR. Both. There is a report prepared by the Council of State Governments called the Forty-eight State School Systems. We have used that. We have used the United States Office of Education Bulletin No. 270, published March 1950, and then we have used the annual report of Hawaii in this.

The CHAIRMAN. Very good.

Dr. SINCLAIR. Now the second point is the university. We have a university that was started in 1907 as an educational institution, then called a college. It is a land-grant institution. There are 51 such land-grant institutions. Ours is fully accredited.

Our students can transfer credits to any college or university. We have absolute equality with the other universities of the country. We have about 5,000 students. Registration went up during the war, but we think that with the increase in population, we will stay about where we are until 1956, and then we shall have to take in more students.

The CHAIRMAN. How large an area has become the property of the university under the land-grant procedure?

Dr. SINCLAIR. Well, do you mean as to colleges or geographical area?

The CHAIRMAN. You spoke of the University of Hawaii as a land-grant institution.

Dr. SINCLAIR. That is right; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How much land do you have?

Dr. SINCLAIR. We do not have any. We have a great distinction. We are the only land-grant institution that does not have any land. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is worth a little amplification, Mr. President.

Dr. SINCLAIR. Usually land for income purposes—and that is what the land grant is—is granted to the university at the time of the admission of the Territory to statehood, but I am so much interested in having Hawaii become a state now, that I am not pressing that point on this occasion.

I would rather have statehood than I would to have land granted to the university, and that is a great concession because we need money badly, you see.

The CHAIRMAN. How were you made a land-grant institution?

Dr. SINCLAIR. That came about in 1910, I think, in the very beginning, because ours was an agricultural school in the beginning, agriculture and engineering, and we qualified because we are the single institution in the State that offered instruction in these two fields of study. Under the old bill of 1862 or 1866 we qualified so that we have had land-grant funds through the years.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you receive any revenue of any kind?

Dr. SINCLAIR. Oh, yes; we get several hundred thousand dollars a year. We qualify because these funds are based on population and not on representation in Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the source of the fund?

Dr. SINCLAIR. There are several funds. You mean the Federal Government?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Dr. SINCLAIR. Well, there is the Morrill Act, the Morrill-Nelson Act, the Hatch Act, the Smith-Hughes Act, several other funds. We qualify exactly as Idaho and Nebraska qualify under funds of that kind. We submit projects to the Department of Agriculture and it approves them.

The CHAIRMAN. But you have no revenue which comes exclusively from land?

Dr. SINCLAIR. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you are not at the present time raising any question as to whether or not any of this public land in Hawaii should be dedicated to the university?

Dr. SINCLAIR. In the interest of getting statehood in the next month or two, I withdraw all requests.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the Treaty of Annexation, however, and under the resolution of acceptance, certain lands are dedicated to the support of the school except those for civil, military, and naval purposes.

Dr. SINCLAIR. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any revenue to the school system or to the university under the provision?

Dr. SINCLAIR. We have none now. After you act possibly there will be, but I know of none now.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to have you, before you have finished, make clear in what manner there might be some. In other words, what action would be possible on the part of the Congress which would provide such revenue?

Dr. SINCLAIR. Yes, sir. We are interested in the statehood bill. Originally, the States were given 30,000 acres of land for each Senator and Representative who came to Congress. The land in Hawaii is limited, as we know.

I talked to Governor Gruening about it at one time, and I said, "Why don't you turn over 100,000 acres of Alaskan land to Hawaii," because the land granted to the universities has not always been granted from the State in which the university is. It has been granted in script from other States. We could sell such land in some way.

Governor Gruening was perfectly willing to give it away on the basis that Alaska had a lot of land up there. But we are not pressing that point because we are so extremely interested in getting statehood and in not interrupting in any way the progress that we have made.

The CHAIRMAN. You say he was perfectly willing to give it away, not having any authority to do so.

Dr. SINCLAIR. Of course. I think that is part of the point.

I should say that we have five colleges in the university, academic, applied science, teachers college, agriculture, and now business administration. We are not trying to duplicate the facilities of other universities.

I know that on statehood my old friend, Nicholas Murray Butler and I disagreed, but on the issue of duplication of facilities we had no disagreement at all. I said Hawaii could do some things better than Columbia could do. He said, "Name one thing." I said, "Tropical agriculture." He said, "I agree with you. You develop that, and we will send our students out there." I said, "Marine biology." He said, "I think you ought to develop there, too, you are in the center of the Pacific." I said, "Pacific and Asiatic civilizations," in which we are very, very much interested, and in which we have one of the six or seven best college libraries in the whole country. He said, "I agree with you."

Now, we cannot do everything in our university because we know our financial limitations, but we can do that which we do better than that which can be done anywhere else. Such programs as I have mentioned are what we are going in for, but I want to impress upon you the fact that the University of Hawaii has absolutely equal standing with the best universities in the country, and I think that they would, themselves, agree with that statement.

We do not have a medical school, we do not have a law school, we do not have a dental school, and I do not know that we want them. We like to have our students go to the mainland and have others come down to Hawaii.

Senator BUTLER. We now have 50 or 60 of your students in Omaha.

Dr. SINCLAIR. We are delighted with that and they are delighted, too. We made a study, as a matter of fact, about 3 years ago, as to the rating of our students who went into professional work in mainland colleges, and I am glad to tell you it is above the average, but I do not have the figures right here.

The CHAIRMAN. You spoke of very high standards of education in the schools of Hawaii, and it is most impressive. What about the literacy standard of the population?

Dr. SINCLAIR. You know in the 1930 census literacy tests were taken, but in the 1940 and 1950 censuses they were omitted, and they were omitted on one ground, and that is this. The census authorities thought they had a better test.

The took the average length of the school year and the number of pupils proportionately who were in the schools, and they preferred that to any literacy test. I cannot give you a statement on literacy, although I have asked the Census Bureau for it. The Government does not take a literacy tally. However, as regards school attendance, the average daily attendance in Hawaii is 92 percent. The average for the whole country—

The CHAIRMAN. Ninety-two percent of what?

Dr. SINCLAIR. Of the possible attendance 92 students out of every 100 go to school every day.

The CHAIRMAN. Ninety-two out of every hundred eligible students?

Dr. SINCLAIR. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And the eligibility is determined by what?

Dr. SINCLAIR. Everyone is compelled to go to school. It is a law.

The CHAIRMAN. So that 92 percent of all of the children of Hawaii are attending school?

Dr. SINCLAIR. That is right.

Senator TAYLOR. On any given day?

Dr. SINCLAIR. Well, that is the average, you see.

Senator TAYLOR. The absenteeism can be caused by illness or other reasons?

Dr. SINCLAIR. Yes; but this is averaged out.

Senator TAYLOR. It is not that 8 percent of them do not go to school at all?

Senator ANDERSON. Would you submit the source of that material, because that seems incredible that the average attendance in the schools should be 92 percent of all people eligible to attend. There is nothing like that elsewhere in the world.

Dr. SINCLAIR. In the States it is 87.8 percent. They say that is a better test of literacy than whether you can read or write. These facts are amazing. I was surprised myself when I learned it was really so high.

Now on the length of school days in Hawaii, the term is 178 days. National median is 178, but we exceed 23 States in that as to the length of the school term. That is the only thing I can give you on literacy. I am sorry.

The CHAIRMAN. President Sinclair, I have before me the Sixteenth Census of the United States, the census of 1940 on Hawaii. On page 9 thereof in table 5 there is a record of the school attendance.

The total population of all races between the ages of 5 to 24 is given as 190,340. The number attending school is given as 110,459. Percentage-wise that is 58 percent. Fifty-eight percent of the total population in the 5-to-24-year group were attending school at that time. That is slightly different from that which you gave us, of course.

Dr. SINCLAIR. Well, this is 5 to 17. This is under the compulsory attendance. Yours is 5 to 24. After 17 some go to jobs, and I think that would make the difference.

Senator ANDERSON. But you get the source of your statement because it still will not figure out. They could not possibly have 92 percent. It could not be anything in the world like that.

Dr. SINCLAIR. Except in Hawaii you mean.

Senator ANDERSON. No. I say it is physically impossible for any school system to have 92 percent of all its children eligible for school in school every day. I think your figure is a 92-percent attendance figure and not a figure of the number of people eligible.

Dr. SINCLAIR. I think that is correct. The figures I give refer to the public schools and do not include the private schools.

Senator ANDERSON. It could not possibly be any other way. There is not anything close to it in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. This table is broken down as follows, and I think it is of interest at this point. Of the Hawaiian population, 2,757 are attending school, constituting 52.7 percent of the eligible number. Part Hawaiian, 17,249, or 64.4 percent; Caucasian, 15,696, or 35.7 percent.

Chinese, 9,148, or 70.6 percent; Filipino, 8,571, or 65.7 percent; Japanese, 52,261, or 64.9 percent. All other races attending school, 4,777, or 60.7 percent of the total.

It will be appreciated if you will be good enough to amplify those figures in the written statement which you will file with the committee later on.

(NOTE.—The material requested was subsequently furnished as follows:)

MAY 5, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Referring to the statistics on public-school attendance, which I gave on Wednesday in my testimony before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in which I pointed out that the average daily attendance in Hawaii was 92.8 percent, and the national medium 87.8 percent, may I say in further explanation thereof that these figures refer solely to public-school attendance and the percentage in average daily attendance. This does not refer to the percentage attendance of all the children of school age—from 5 years to 17 years.

Because of the questions that were asked regarding my figures, I sent a radiogram to Dean Bruce White, Teachers College, University of Hawaii, with a request for figures on the total population, and so forth, from 5 to 17 years of age. I just received a radiogram from him with this information and if possible I would like to have it inserted in the record with the explanation I have given here.

"Total population, ages 5 to 17, 120,616; enrollment, ages 5 to 17: Public, 87,390; private, 23,610; total enrollment, kindergarten to grade 12 public, 90,593; average daily attendance same basis, 85,970; attendance private estimated approximately similar. All data December 1949. Signed—WHITE, University of Hawaii."

Sincerely yours,

GREGG M. SINCLAIR,
President, University of Hawaii.

Dr. SINCLAIR. Yes, indeed, I will be happy to do that. These figures were made up for me by the dean of our College of Education, and he is a statistical expert.

The University of Hawaii has a system of visiting professors. We try to bring distinguished professors from all over the country for shorter or longer terms of teaching.

On April 24 I suddenly got the idea, "How do these people feel about statehood," because they lived in Hawaii. They were not tourists. They lived there for a summer session or during a semester or school year.

I immediately dashed off a little questionnaire. Unfortunately it has not been tabled yet because some of the returns came in only today, and yet of the 64 that we sent out to all the American citizens—we have visiting professors from Europe and Asia as well as America—52 replied, and every single one was in favor of the immediate granting of statehood to Hawaii, every single one. The summary is as follows:

VISITING PROFESSORS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII SAY HAWAII SHOULD BE GRANTED STATEHOOD NOW

The University of Hawaii has developed a plan of bringing to Hawaii visiting professors from mainland universities—men and women teachers with established mainland reputations as among the best in their fields.

Since 1942, there have been 64 visiting professors with American citizenship who have come to Hawaii to live while teaching at the university for a summer session, or during the regular college year.

On April 24, 1950, these 64 educators were asked by the president of the university to state their opinion as to Hawaii's readiness for statehood. By May 3, 1950, 52 replied—all 52 supported statehood for Hawaii now. Represented were men and women from 39 universities and colleges in 19 States. Their comments are given below:

1. The granting of statehood to this outpost of democracy in the Pacific will (1) give immeasurable encouragement to freedom-loving peoples everywhere, and (2) strengthen the position of the United States among the nations of the world, thereby promoting world peace.—ROSS A. BAKER, City College of New York.

2. Hawaii has long since earned the right to statehood and it would be a blot upon our democratic system not to grant it.—DR. GRAHAM H. STUART, Stanford University.

3. I spent 5 months in Honolulu in 1948. Since Congress was considering statehood at that time, I studied the situation rather carefully. I saw no reason then—and see none now—for denying statehood to Hawaii.—H. L. EWBANK, University of Wisconsin.

4. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—F. H. MACDOUGALL, University of Minnesota.

5. I spent 2½ months in Hawaii, during which time I visited five of the islands and mingled widely with all types of people. I was always aware of a high degree of social and political acumen, and a fine sense of responsibility. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—MENTOR L. WILLIAMS, Illinois Institute of Technology.

6. I have made half dozen speeches on Hawaii and in each case have expressed the opinion that statehood should be granted.—GLADYS L. BORCHERS, University of Wisconsin.

7. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now. We are proud of the American brand of democracy * * *.—ROBERT W. FREDERICK, New York State College for Teachers.

8. The excellent program of education in Hawaii has done much to prepare her citizens for the responsibilities of statehood. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—CHARLES F. WELLS, State University of New York, State Teachers College.

9. Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—ROY G. BLAKEY, University of Minnesota Emeritus.

10. I found more realism and more practical democracy in Hawaii than in at least two other States in which I have resided. Those who are definitely opposed to statehood for Hawaii are apt to be so because of ignorance of conditions and the absence of first-hand knowledge of the islands.—C. GILBERT WRENN, University of Minnesota.

11. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now. I believe in the fullest measure of local self-government for Americans everywhere. To keep any part of the country under tutelage of Washington is an affront to American ideals.—H. G. DEMING, University of Nebraska.

12. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—MISS ARLIEN JOHNSON, University of Southern California.

13. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now. It was my observation during 6 months' stay in Hawaii that the people of Hawaii generally held a better appreciation of the true meaning of American democracy and a keener recognition of the responsibilities of representative government than did the people of those several States of the United States in which I have been resident.—PHILIP H. TAYLOR, Syracuse University.

14. While at the University of Hawaii I had the privilege of teaching many of the Nisei who had proved their loyalty to their country by fighting from Africa to the English Channel. We are ingrates if we do not show these fine young men that we appreciate their efforts by granting Hawaii statehood now.—HARLOW C. RICHARDSON, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.

15. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now. From the standpoint of education, democratic ideals, and loyalty to our Government, Hawaii compares favorably with the States now in the Union.—W. A. SAUCIER, Baker University, Baldwin, Kans.

16. I do not believe that any other Territory which was admitted to the Union had a better case than Hawaii. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—RAYMOND UHL, formerly Maryland State planning commission consultant.

17. During the summer of 1949, I not only taught in Hawaii's summer session, and attended the very interesting East-West Philosophers Conference, but I was engaged particularly for the final month or so in making studies of a social scientific character under auspices of the Social Science Research Council. I was thus constrained to study island social, cultural, and economic structure rather carefully at first hand, albeit for a brief period. Hawaii is socially, culturally, and economically our western frontier State. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—MARVIN K. OPLER, Occidental College.

18. Hawaii is as modern, well-developed, and the people as cultured as those of any State in the Union; and I can see no good reason for denying it statehood at this time.—A. J. SALLE, University of California at Los Angeles.

19. I decidedly believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now. From my contacts with University of Hawaii students during 2 years as visiting professor there, I found them loyal and well informed. I consider Hawaii ready for statehood and well prepared for carrying on its own government.—ORIS W. FREEMAN, Eastern Washington College of Education.

20. I am sure that the students I dealt with in my classes while in Hawaii, as well as my association with businessmen on the various islands, proved to me that the majority of people in Hawaii are good Americans and will be one of our stronger States.—HALVER M. SKINNER, Montana State College.

21. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—MRS. LOUISE H. HOWE, Salt Lake City, Utah.

22. In terms of the loyalty of its citizens, tax support of the Federal Government, and contribution to national life, Hawaii deserves statehood now.—CLARENCE T. SIMON, Northwestern University.

23. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now. This is based on my observations in Hawaii during the summer of 1947. Delay of statehood would in my opinion be most unfortunate.—J. D. HICKS, University of California.

24. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—MRS. HAZEL N. MORGAN, formerly University of Minnesota.

25. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now. The people on the islands are economically self-supporting, educated, and enthusiastic citizens of our country. They surely deserve to have their home islands become a State in the United States of America.—RUSSELL V. MORGAN, Western Reserve, Cleveland, Ohio.

26. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now. My classes in education included a cross section of all national and racial groups in the Territory. I also got into the schools and observed the student bodies. I was deeply impressed with the high level of thinking and the intense loyalty to the United States.—V. T. THAYER, Ethnical Culture Schools, New York.

27. I am sure that all of us at Ohio State University who have taught in Hawaii are of one mind on this question. We want Hawaii to become a State.

Its qualifications cannot be questioned by any person with integrity.—NORMAN WOELFEL, Ohio State University.

28. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—E. C. ACHESON, George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

29. There is no doubt in my mind about the maturity of those who would govern the Territory or of the devotion of virtually the entire population. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—STANLEY T. WILLIAMS, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

30. Hawaii has a unique contribution to make to the United States, the leader of the democratic nations. Hawaii can make that contribution even more effectively, at home and abroad, as a State than as a Territory. I am convinced that Hawaii for years has been ready for statehood.—CLARENCE E. GLICK, formerly chairman, sociology department, Tulane University; now at University of Hawaii.

31. I consider it a disgrace that Hawaii has not been granted statehood, at least right after the war, in 1945. Statehood is long overdue.—Prof. B. M. STANFIELD, Columbia University, New York City.

32. My observations convince me that the Hawaiian Islands are ready and fully qualified for statehood. To deny statehood now would be a severe blow to excellent island morale; to grant statehood now will strengthen not only these islands but our Nation and its influence in both Occident and Orient.—RUPERT L. CORTRIGHT, Wayne University, Detroit, Mich.

33. I have found students in Hawaii equal to the best on the mainland as to patriotism, intelligence, and vigor. It is a loss to the Nation and an injustice to them to be denied first-class citizenship. The same applies to citizens of Hawaii in general.—ALFRED H. JONES, Syracuse University emeritus; now at University of Hawaii.

34. I spent 1920-22 in Hawaii. I returned as a visitor in 1924. I have lived with people in their homes on the five largest islands. In view of the United States' commitment to Hawaii and of what I know of Hawaii, further delay would be breaking faith.—JOSEPH F. SMITH, visiting professor, University of Hawaii.

35. In terms of maturity—educational, economic, political—I consider Hawaii ready for statehood.—A. M. MYHRMAN, visiting professor, University of Hawaii.

36. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now. Fifty years is a long enough "cooling off" period. Hawaii has met the tests required of other Territories.—HAROLD S. ROBERTS, visiting professor, University of Hawaii.

37. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—M. W. DE LAUBENFELS, visiting professor, University of Hawaii.

38. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now. I find my students here as alert and as American as those I had at Stanford, San Diego, and Harvard.—Dr. A. GUERARD, visiting professor, University of Hawaii.

39. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—H. E. STELSON, visiting professor, University of Hawaii.

40. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—DONALD C. MATTHEWS, visiting professor, University of Hawaii.

41. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—Dr. CLAUDE H. EWING, Washburn Trade School, Chicago.

42. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—J. F. STEINER, professor emeritus, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

43. Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—GEORGE F. WHICHER, Amherst College, Massachusetts.

44. Hawaii is far more American, in spirit and loyalty to the principles of democracy, than is my home State of New Jersey. The Hawaiian people and newspapers manifest an unusual catholicity of interest in political and economic issues in every State of the Union. In fact, I resent strongly that the Territory of Hawaii has gone so long unrewarded.—HUBERT W. ALYEA, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

45. During the academic year 1947-48 I strove with the utmost sociological detachment to size up the situation as regards statehood. Not only did I try to sense student attitudes but I also mingled much with unlettered citizens such as the Puerto Rican groups. Everywhere I found evidence of ardent Americanism and emphasis upon good citizenship. Nowhere did I detect anything that would cast a substantial shadow over what seemed to me an overwhelming eagerness for statehood. At times I have felt that the clamor raised by the minority opposition, particularly about communism, sprang from motives that were rooted in un-American racism.—Prof. LEE M. BROOKS, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.

46. I believe that the citizens of Hawaii are fully as loyal to the United States as those of any State. In fact, I know of no valid reason why Hawaii should not be admitted to statehood now.—LOUIS BRAND, University of Cincinnati, Ohio.

47. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—Miss LORETTA T. SCHULER, visiting professor, University of Hawaii.

48. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—Dr. STEVENSON SMITH, University of Washington.

49. My year at the university (1947-48) convinced me that the over-all situation in Hawaii corresponds to more that is favorable and to less that is unfavorable for equal membership in our United States than characterizes most of our present States.—PHILIP W. L. COX, Massachusetts.

50. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—W. BRIGANCE, Washash College, Indiana.

51. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—STUART BROWN, Syracuse University, New York.

52. I think in the light of its resources, tax payments to the United States, strategic importance, educational and social progress, Hawaii distinctly ought to be a State in the United States. I believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood now.—LOWELL E. NOLAND, University of Wisconsin.

Now I just want to make one other statement, if I may, and that is that we recognize the fact in the university that Hawaii has been made by the scientists. If there were no scientists there, we would have a very little place except for the military, and yet I think that it is important to know, too, that the quality of scientific thinking has penetrated the people just the same as the quality of the educational system was largely responsible for the fact that the people responded so beautifully in the greatest crisis that any people ever faced; that is, on and after December 7. People should know that without the scientists there would not be any Hawaii, such as we know it.

I think it is a startling thing for some mainlanders to be told that it takes a ton of water to produce a pound of sugar, 2,000 times as much water as the sugar that is made. The scientists have analyzed all of these different factors, but back of those factors are the businessmen who are responsible for employing the scientists to do this work.

We have never seen any disposition on the part of our businessmen on the board of regents—and the Governor has appointed the best board of regents we have ever had—to cut down the work of the university in the question of the development of the academic, the cultural side or the scientific side. The businessmen on the board and in the Territory have been farsighted.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the experience of the graduates of the university in finding employment?

Dr. SINCLAIR. They have had no difficulty at all up to this year. We anticipate that this year, with the unemployment situation as it is in Hawaii, they are going to have a lot of trouble, but up to this year, including last year, our graduates have all been employed.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any report on that?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I do not think so. We have inquired, but we have never had any person apply for a job to us who is a graduate of the university.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have a division of your faculty or the office of the dean that has any responsibility for helping students find employment?

Dr. SINCLAIR. Yes; we do have a director of student personnel.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have a report on that activity?

Dr. SINCLAIR. Well, I do not have it with me. It has concerned mainly the students who are in the university at the moment, because

we have had no problem of the employment of graduates up to this year. Only in the last year since unemployment became pronounced have we had such requests, and we are establishing a placement bureau in September of this year.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you familiar with the situation to the extent that you can tell the committee what the character of the unemployment is?

Dr. SINCLAIR. Well, I think others probably are a little better informed on that than I am. I know there are about 30,000 unemployed, but the details I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. It is important, in all of these considerations with respect to economic and political development of any of our areas, to learn what the opportunities for employment are likely to be and what the obstacles to employment are likely to be.

Dr. SINCLAIR. Yes; of course.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, sir. Have you finished your statement?

Dr. SINCLAIR. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Butler.

Senator BUTLER. I can say, so far as the impression one gets when he visits Hawaii is concerned, as I have done, you get the impression that the high schools of the city are a very important part of the set-up of the whole community.

I never saw bigger ones or better ones or more enthusiasm so far as the high schools are concerned.

I was interested in the details, the statistics, that you gave, and we shall study them over with more interest.

You did, Mr. President, touch on the communistic situation, and I do not care to press it at all if you in your official capacity do not care to say anything about it, but there was a fuss out there over the Reinecke trial—Mr. Fujimoto, I believe, was the name—and it may be that you want to say something about it, and it may be that you do not. I am perfectly willing that you use your own judgment in the matter.

Dr. SINCLAIR. I am perfectly willing to talk about it so far as it concerns the university.

Senator BUTLER. That is all I expect you to do.

Dr. SINCLAIR. We have no Communists on the university faculty. Reinecke was there for 1 year, I think, from 1935 to 1936, on a 1-year appointment. Then he left, and he has not been connected with the university since.

Senator BUTLER. Well, was it from the university or from the public schools that he was discharged?

Dr. SINCLAIR. Public schools. He has not been with the public schools since.

Fujimoto is a person who was a junior chemist in the experiment station. He never came in contact with the students; there was never at any time any trouble with him, so far as the university is concerned. He did his work very well. I am told he is quite a brilliant boy.

During the war we had an American Youth for Democracy organization at the university. It was founded really by some soldiers, I believe, from New York. If the mainlanders would leave us alone I think we would get along pretty well on communism. These soldier boys came up to the university and formed a Hawaiian Youth for Democracy organization.

I investigated it, and I think there might have been as many as four who were communistic students. Others were simply led into it. After they found out what it was it immediately disbanded. I can assure you there is not a single Communist on the university faculty today.

Senator BUTLER. I think perhaps there is some trace of that group in many of the schools on the mainland, so you would not be the exception if you had some trace of it out there.

Dr. SINCLAIR. Well, as a good Democrat, I will say that we do not all vote the Republican ticket. We very violently dislike the whole effort on the part of the Communists to dominate a particular party that we love and adore, you see, and we want to make it an effective party. That I think is our position.

Senator BUTLER. The Delegate has told us that he will give us considerable information on that situation before the hearings are completed, and bring us up to date on the convention that was held there last Sunday. I was going to ask you, too, Mr. President, if you had not had some support for the maintenance of the university from private sources, the people of the islands.

Dr. SINCLAIR. Very little support from private sources. The HSPA—that is, the Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association—the Pineapple Research Institute, and the university cooperate in an agricultural engineering institute. The sugar people put that up at the expense of \$100,000.

That is one phase of local support that I should mention, but generally speaking the university, being a young university with its reputation still to make, the great businessmen downtown naturally think not of it, but of their old colleges—Yale, Harvard, and Princeton, and so on—and they send a lot of money over there. I think they do not understand the theory upon which John Harvard built his university. When he gave his thousand dollars and his few hundred books to a little struggling denominational college in the neighborhood, instead of sending it back to his alma mater, Cambridge, I think he gave a lead that our people should follow, but we have not been able to make them see the point yet.

I will say this: The legislature has been very, very fine and statesmanlike in attempting to build up the university. It has done us a wonderful chore in helping us to get men who are important and significant.

Senator BUTLER. When I visited the island it was unfortunate that you were absent from the Territory at that time, but I will say that the visit to the university was a very pleasant one and made a very fine impression upon me and those who were with me.

I think I made the statement out there at the time that the University of Hawaii has a wonderful opportunity not only for the people of the Hawaiian Islands but for all the other Pacific area and even for the Orient, and I was wondering if there is a tendency for attendance from the other Pacific islands.

Dr. SINCLAIR. Yes; and that is something that I would have mentioned if I had had more time, but I think what I have said is more significant and to the point.

The University of Hawaii does feel that it has an obligation to the people of the Pacific, but it also has this point; that we do not have dormitories in the university. The housing in Hawaii is very bad.

We get requests from students in every State in the Union, from practically every country in Europe, and from practically every country in Asia, asking us if they can come to Hawaii. We have to give them a negative answer because we simply do not have housing, but the attention is focused upon Hawaii in a world sense.

I think that if you grant statehood for Hawaii it will give a very great lift to this whole international movement. The university meeting that I attended Monday and Tuesday in Chicago devoted a considerable amount of time to the significance of Asia at this particular time, and after two people got through making their speeches, one man immediately got up and said, "Are you changing your curriculum by reason of information that you found out what we needed to know about India," and was answered, "We certainly are."

On Friday and Saturday there is a meeting of the council on education. They are devoting their whole time to one point, this is, the system of American education in relationship to the world.

Nothing would be so significant as statehood for Hawaii so far as all the schools of the mainland are concerned in directing their attention to another new approach to living. We have been churning over the old stuff you know for a hundred or 200 years. Now it is time to get in and understand Asia. We have to do it whether we want to do it or not, and the appreciation of that attitude is our particular approach in Hawaii.

Last summer we had a philosophers' conference that was attended by distinguished men from China, Japan, India, Ceylon, as well as from the mainland. For 6 weeks we devoted our efforts to finding out the points of similarity and the points of difference between eastern and western ways of looking at life, trying to find a common synthesis that would be the groundwork for the change in attitude in the philosophical departments of our universities and also their universities.

Senator LEHMAN. May I ask you one question, Mr. President. You said you had no figures on literacy, but you did give some figures on attendance or on matriculation which certainly were very impressive to me.

I was wondering what comparison you could make with regard to the standard of curriculum in the high schools and grade schools of Honolulu as compared to the average city on the mainland.

Dr. SINCLAIR. I think ours would be just as high, because many of our graduates, our teachers, have taken work in mainland institutions, you see. They have a broad point of view. Besides, we have an excellent system of exchange of teachers with mainland high schools and public schools.

In the universities especially we seldom employ a local person. That would be in-breeding. Generally speaking, he has got to come from the mainland in order to be appointed.

As to our visiting professors, I have often said, "If you reduce your standards in Hawaii and let a student pass because you are a visiting professor here, we will never again invite you back. You have got to hold to the highest mainland standards in order to qualify here."

I think the same is true with reference to the high schools. I believe that their curriculum and their ways of doing things would be comparable to the best in America. At least we are trying to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions?

Senator ANDERSON. I just want to say that I think the University of Hawaii has done a fine job of recognizing its responsibility to agriculture in Hawaii. It recognizes the importance of agriculture in the income of the islands.

My visit to the university persuaded me it was doing a splendid job and certainly if Hawaii is given statehood, it has a university that is matched up and ready to go with the State. I certainly want to congratulate you on the fine job that I know personally you have done.

Senator BUTLER. I can confirm what Senator Anderson has said. I would like to ask you, though, if any plans are being considered by your board of regents looking toward the construction of dormitories which I think would add tremendously to your opportunities.

Dr. SINCLAIR. Yes. One women's dormitory is to be built this year and one of the reasons that I am down here is to find out whether Hawaii cannot qualify under the \$300,000,000 loan bill which you passed I think only a week or two ago.

Under that there is one provision which says that the administrator must be able to foreclose property if the rents do not come through. Now they do not expect to take over the property. They just would take it over until the obligations are met, and then they would turn it back, according to the bill, but I do not know how we can qualify under that bill unless we have the land in fee simple, unless the land is in the Regents' name.

I do not know how we can do that, and that is one of the things I am going to find out about in Washington. Dormitories are our big need in the University of Hawaii today.

The CHAIRMAN. You spoke of the large number of applications which are received for the enrollment of students from beyond the Territory of Hawaii, whose applications cannot be received because of conditions under which you operate. From what areas do those applications come?

Dr. SINCLAIR. Do you mean in the United States or abroad?

The CHAIRMAN. In the world.

Dr. SINCLAIR. Japan, a very great number, Korea, a very great number, China, now a very great number, the Philippines, Siam, India. They are in the main areas of Asia. They look to Hawaii.

The CHAIRMAN. What, if any, steps have you attempted to take to equip the university to become a center of education for Asiatic areas?

Dr. SINCLAIR. We have a Pacific and Asiatic studies department. In that department we give courses in Japanese, Chinese, and the cultures of Asia. We probably have as many courses and students studying Asia, than have all the New England colleges put together.

So far as bringing these people to Hawaii is concerned, we can do nothing until we get dormitories, but we have that in mind. That is a major step, and I think it can be a real contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the lack of dormitories alone that prevents you from permitting such—

Dr. SINCLAIR. Alone, that is right, the lack of dormitories.

Senator BUTLER. The prospective students have means for coming?

Dr. SINCLAIR. Usually, yes. Some do not, but usually they do.

The CHAIRMAN. What would it cost to build an adequate dormitory for such a purpose?

Dr. SINCLAIR. We want to house half our student body some day. That will be 2,000 students at the least. We are putting up a girls' dormitory now and it is costing \$450,000.

Senator BUTLER. For how many?

Dr. SINCLAIR. For 132 girls.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you made any effort to secure an endowment to be devoted to the construction of dormitories?

Dr. SINCLAIR. Oh, yes; but without success. We recognize the problem.

If we had dormitories there for 2,000 students, really the University of Hawaii would be of world significance. Also in summer students could go to Hawaii for 6 weeks and get college credit. We think we could have 5,000 students from the mainland in summer.

The CHAIRMAN. If Hawaii were made a State, what in your opinion would be the prospect of action by the State legislature to provide appropriations sufficient to construct dormitories?

Dr. SINCLAIR. Well, I think the legislators are quite sympathetic if means are available, but of course in the last year or two our Territory has been in a little financial difficulty due again to mainlanders.

Senator BUTLER. I agree.

Dr. SINCLAIR. But the legislators have told me individually that that is one of the great concerns that they are interested in. I have every belief that we will get dormitories.

The CHAIRMAN. What will be the effect of statehood upon the financial position of the islands?

Dr. SINCLAIR. I think it will be much better, but, of course, that is an opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions?

Thank you very much, President Sinclair.

May I insert in the record at this point the full text of the report submitted by President Sinclair involving certain statistics on education which he presented.

(The document above referred to follows:)

We have prepared a comparison of public schools in Hawaii with those in the 48 States on 19 points, 6 in the area of financial support, 5 in reference to enrollment and attendance, 3 dealing with centralization, and 5 on the preparation and qualification of teachers.

The data on the basis of which these comparisons were made were secured from the Forty-eight State School System, a report prepared by the Council of State Governments, 1949; from Statistics of School Systems, United States Office of Education Bulletin No. 270, March 1950; and from annual and biennial report of the department of public instruction, Territory of Hawaii, together with other official records of this department.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF HAWAII

Statistical comparison with the 48 States, school year 1949

BASIC STATISTICS—HAWAII

Number of schools	187
Pupils enrolled	85,781
Teachers and staff	3,583
Teacher-pupil ration	1-32
Total expenditures	\$16,159,802.00
Per capita cost per pupil in average daily attendance	\$199.25
Average annual salary, teachers	\$3,320.00

PUBLIC-SCHOOL FINANCING, STATISTICS AND COMPARISONS

1. Per capita cost per pupil in average daily attendance :	
Hawaii-----	\$199. 25
National median-----	\$178. 71
Number of States Hawaii exceeds-----	33
2. Average annual salary for teachers :	
Hawaii-----	\$3, 320
National median-----	\$2, 440
Number of States Hawaii exceeds-----	45
3. Percent of school revenues gained from Federal sources :	
Hawaii-----percent--	1. 3
National median-----do--	1. 3
Number of States Hawaii exceeds-----	26
4. Percent of school revenues gained from State sources :	
Hawaii-----percent--	82. 8
National median-----do--	39.8
Number of States Hawaii exceeds-----	46
(Hawaii has a Territorial system, and does not have districts.)	
5. Percent of school revenues gained from county sources :	
Hawaii-----percent--	15. 9
National median-----do--	5. 7
Number of States Hawaii exceeds-----	35
6. Percent of school revenues gained from local district sources :	
Hawaii-----	0
National median-----percent--	53. 2
Number of States receiving more from districts than Hawaii -----	48

PUBLIC SCHOOL ATTENDANCE, STATISTICS AND COMPARISONS

1. Percent of total population composed of children of school age (5-17) :	
Hawaii-----percent--	21. 9
National median-----do--	20. 3
Number of States Hawaii exceeds-----	27
2. Average daily attendance :	
Hawaii-----percent--	92. 8
(Average daily attendance is 92.8 percent of total enrollment.)	
National median-----percent--	87. 8
Number of States Hawaii exceeds-----	46
3. Length of school term in days :	
Hawaii-----	178
National median-----	178. 4
Number of States Hawaii exceeds-----	23
4. Percent of total elementary school enrollment (kindergarten-eighth grade) which is enrolled in kindergartens :	
Hawaii-----percent--	7. 2
National median-----do--	4. 0
Number of States Hawaii exceeds-----	35
5. Percent of total school enrollment (kindergarten-twelfth grade) which is enrolled in secondary school ninth-twelfth grades) :	
Hawaii-----percent--	27. 8
National median-----do--	24. 3
Number of States Hawaii exceeds-----	40

Centralization factors, statistics and comparisons

1. Percent of elementary schools which are 1-teacher schools :	
Hawaii-----percent--	6. 4
National median-----do--	35. 8
Number of States having a larger percentage than Hawaii-----	48
2. Percent of high schools enrolling less than 100 pupils :	
Hawaii-----percent--	5. 8
National median-----do--	43. 2
Number of States having a larger percentage than Hawaii-----	45
3. Percent of high schools enrolling more than 300 pupils :	
Hawaii-----percent--	76. 5
National median-----do--	17. 5
Number of States Hawaii exceeds-----	47

Preparation of teachers, statistics and comparisons

1. Percentage of teachers with less than bachelor's degree:		
Hawaii	percent	28.8
National median	do	40.9
Number of States having a greater percentage than Hawaii		40
2. Percent of teachers holding bachelor or higher degrees:		
Hawaii	percent	71.2
National median	do	59.1
Number of States Hawaii exceeds		40
3. Percent of teachers holding masters (or equivalent) or higher degrees:		
Hawaii	percent	39.6
National median	do	14.4
Number of States Hawaii exceeds		47
4. Requirements in years of college training for elementary-school State teaching certificate:		
Hawaii	years	5
17 States	do	4
3 States	do	3
13 States	do	2
9 States	do	1
6 States	do	0
National median	do	2
Number of States Hawaii exceeds		48
5. Requirements in years of college training for high-school State teaching certificate:		
Hawaii	years	5
3 States	do	5
39 States	do	4
4 States	do	2
2 States	do	0
National median	do	4
Number of States Hawaii exceeds		45

POINTS OF EMPHASIS INDICATED BY THESE STATISTICS

1. Hawaii has a larger proportion of school-age children to educate than do 27 States.

2. Yet Hawaii has a larger proportion of these pupils in daily attendance than 46 States and spends more per capita for their education than do 33 States.

3. Despite this relatively heavy load of school-age children, Hawaii pays its teachers better than 45 States and receives no more help from Federal funds than the average State.

4. Despite this relatively heavy load of school-age children, Hawaii starts more of them in kindergarten than 35 States and retains them longer in secondary school than 40 States.

5. Hawaii's centralized system results in equalization of educational opportunity in rural as well as urban areas.

6. Centralization has given Hawaii fewer one-teacher schools than any State and more large high schools than 47 States.

7. Hawaii's teachers have more years of training than over three-fourths of the States.

8. Hawaii's standards for teacher certification are the highest in the Nation.

MAIN SOURCES OF DATA

Annual and Biennial Reports of the Department of Public Instruction, 1930-49.
Official Department of Public Instruction Records.

The Forty-eight State School Systems, prepared by the Council of State Governments, 1949.

Statistics of School Systems, United States Office of Education Bulletin, No. 270, March 1950.

Mr. FARRINGTON. The next witness is the president of the Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Mr. Henry White.

STATEMENT OF HENRY A. WHITE, PRESIDENT OF HAWAIIAN
PINEAPPLE CO., HONOLULU, T. H.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, my name is Henry A. White.

The CHAIRMAN. We welcome you, Mr. White.

Mr. WHITE. I was born and raised in Hawaii, went to school there, and I am presently the president of the Hawaiian Pineapple Co.

I have a prepared statement here that I would like to read if you will bear with me.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. WHITE. It is my hope—and I share that hope with the vast majority of people in Hawaii—that the Senate of the United States of America will quickly follow the action of the House of Representatives and pass legislation enabling Hawaii to become a State.

While I appear here today as a representative of industry, as head of the oldest and largest pineapple company in Hawaii, I want to stress my deep citizen interest in statehood.

It was because of this personal citizen interest that I ran for—and was elected to—a seat in the Hawaiian constitutional convention.

It is a matter of deep gratification that I was chosen from a field including persons of many different racial extractions by an electorate marked by the same diversity of racial extraction.

Even more gratifying to me is the fact that I was urged to run for Delegate and personally supported by a substantial number of the employees of the Hawaiian Pineapple Co.; and I might add that their racial composition represents a good cross section of Honolulu.

Voters in Hawaii are people who, like those of any of the States, are a responsible, mature group of Americans, deeply aware and profoundly proud of the voting privilege which goes with being American. These people are citizens first, and members of different races only by ancestry and the hand of God.

I say with deep sincerity that my campaigning, which brought me in contact with all types of voters throughout the area in which I ran, convinced me beyond any shadow of doubt that the voters of Hawaii are interested in the same basic thing which all good voters seek, and that is sound leadership.

Industry generally in Hawaii deserves a special comment, for it is a magnificent example of the results of the kind of free enterprise which we all like to think characterizes our country. Both the sugar and pineapple industries were created and developed in the face of great obstacles by men who lived and worked in Hawaii, utilizing capital created by their own efforts in Hawaii.

Over the years, earnings from enterprises in the Hawaiian Islands have gone right back into the development of Hawaii to make more and better jobs for everybody, to develop our schools, hospitals, our culture, our people.

There are few natural resources in Hawaii. There are no metals or oils, no coal. We have created our highly industrialized agricultural enterprise from the sun, the rain, and the soil.

As many of you know, the development of our basic industries has required millions of dollars for research. This research has been carried on by the industries themselves without aid from the Federal Government. I might add that we are leaders in the world in scientific

agriculture. We have combed the world for new varieties of sugarcane and pineapple. We have done the same to find parasites that will destroy or control the bugs that eat our plants. We have designed and built special machinery for our field and plant operations, some of which has been and can be advantageously adapted to other industries on the mainland. We have drilled tunnels through mountains to bring mountain water into our fields for irrigation.

Very few people realize that the pineapple industry doesn't lend itself to the so-called small, independent type of farming. The facts are that the industry has become so highly mechanized that a small farmer could not afford to carry the equipment necessary to modern pineapple agricultural operations.

You also hear a lot of talk about producing other farm products in Hawaii, but this talk must be laid against the cold, limiting facts.

Temperature and rainfall determine what can be grown in any given area. We lie at about 20° north in latitude.

This means that you can grow only those things which can thrive in the same general latitude, from say about 20° north to 20° south. You couldn't grow peaches, or apples, or pears, or strawberries, since trees and plants of this kind need a rest period during winter or cold months, which our temperature in Hawaii does not provide.

Aside from that, however, once limiting yourself to things you can grow, like cotton, for example, there are the problems of differential in labor costs which are very high in Hawaii, distance from markets, transportation costs, and so forth.

There are, of course, opportunities for more crops for self-sustenance, but even here, it has been found uneconomical in the long run to devote too much acreage to home-grown things rather than to cash crops upon which our balance of trade depends.

All of these things are not matters of personal opinion; they are matters of fact, based upon experience, both before and during the war period. We devoted a lot of land for food during the war, but at that time it was not a matter of what was most economical to do, but rather of what was necessary with the constant threat of being cut off from other sources of supply.

Many people have been led to believe that Hawaii is a tightly held, little Territory in which a few people have most of the wealth and most of the enterprises. This is far from the truth.

There are examples of interlocking directorates in Hawaii, just as there are in many other similar communities in America. But the fact that a man serves on more than one board of directors is a reflection of the fact that any small area has serious limits on its executive talent, and men who are good are widely used because of their abilities, not because of any ulterior reasons. Our pattern in Hawaii in this respect, I should state, is typical of the pattern in other American communities.

I think it is important for you gentlemen to realize that Hawaii is not a fabulously wealthy place as is sometimes supposed. By mainland standards, corporations there are very small. The total assets of all corporations in Hawaii put together amount to less than the total assets of Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., for example. The total assets of all corporations in Hawaii amount to only about one-fourth of A. T. & T. for example.

Moreover, the roughly 1,000 corporations in Hawaii have more than 34,000 stockholders, so that the benefits from these enterprises are widely spread. In addition, more than 30,000 individuals or groups hold business licenses in the Territory, operating every conceivable kind of enterprise. I think it is fair to say that the general business structure in Hawaii is much more like than unlike any other community of similar size on the mainland.

My own company, for example, has roughly about 5,000 stockholders.

I think, however, that you will find that Hawaiian industry in general ethics and in general civic-mindedness rates with the best of American communities. We support all worth-while community activities, both with dollars and men, and have consistently done our best to make Hawaii a place where people are proud to live.

I think also that the efforts of industry in Hawaii are reflected in the condition that the middle class in Hawaii is as well off as, or better off than, the middle class in any community you want to pick in America. The typical member of the middle class in Hawaii lives in a house rather than an apartment; has a car; sends his children to a good school; is able to contribute to his church; participates in the community chest and in community affairs generally; is able to go out to the beach without too much trouble on a Sunday afternoon, and to live a life of sensible balance between work and play. There is really no poverty in Hawaii as it is known in some of the large cities on the mainland.

We recognize that we have great beauty and a highly salubrious climate in Hawaii to contribute to our general case of living for our peoples; but it is also important to note that the general harmony of relations between members of different races who make up our middle class, our ability to get along together, to live and work and play together is also an essential element in the enviable picture.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt you at that point, Mr. White. You spoke of the number of stockholders of your company, the Hawaiian Pineapple Co., as being roughly about 5,000. How many of them are citizens of Hawaii?

Mr. WHITE. The bulk of them are citizens of Hawaii. We do have a large number of mainland stockholders though. Some of them were the original backers of Mr. Dole at the time he started the company, and their holdings have passed on to their heirs or have been spread around as their estates were broken up.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any corporate stockholders?

Mr. WHITE. Oh; yes, sir. Our company is controlled about 49.8 percent by two corporations, Castle & Cook and Waialua Agricultural Co.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the second one?

Mr. WHITE. Waialua Agricultural Co., now Heleman Co. The stock has been transferred to a holding company known as Heleman Co.

That change in ownership developed during 1932 when the pineapple company experienced very severe set-backs during the depression period. At that time pineapple was looked upon more as a luxury product.

When depression was felt on the mainland, why, the consumption of pineapple dropped markedly and it was therefore necessary to reorganize the Hawaiian Pineapple Co.

In 1931 they borrowed \$5,000,000 on notes, and then when they went into their 1931 operating season, they had to make their seasonal bank borrowings, and in 1932 they found themselves pathetically short of cash. The \$5,000,000 was gone and they were in the banks to the extent of about three and a half million.

At that time it was necessary to work out a reorganization of the company, which accounts for the predominant stock interest that these two companies had in it at that time, because they bailed the company out.

At the time of the reorganization, Waialua Agricultural—who owns a good part of the land that the pineapple company operates on—owned one-third of the stock, which they acquired in 1923 at the time that the Hawaiian Pineapple Co. purchased the Island of Lanai.

When 1932 came along, it was practically impossible to get funds either on the mainland or locally, things were bad, and Waialua, as the major stockholder, agreed to take up its one-third pro rata of a new issue and together with Castle & Cook underwrite the remaining two-thirds.

It so happens that when the subscriptions were in, only 2,880 shares of stock were subscribed for by the old stockholders, so that Waialua, Castle & Cook had to take up practically the entire issue, and that is how they got to have such a large control.

I might say at that particular time that, looking at it from the standpoint of Waialua, it would have been a lot better to have let the pineapple company go and pick up the pieces. They could have done it a lot cheaper and I can recall one of my first jobs when I went down there, the new capital that was put in was a million and a half, and the first 4 or 5 months there was a serious question in my mind as to whether the million and a half was going to last, whether it was enough or whether we would have to go out and make additional borrowings.

THE CHAIRMAN. Of these 5,000 stockholders, how many are citizens of Hawaii who are not associated with either of these two corporate stockholders?

MR. WHITE. The bulk of them. They may also own stock in some of these companies, because Castle & Cook—

THE CHAIRMAN. Do you know what the average stockholding is?

MR. WHITE. No. I could probably get it for you.

THE CHAIRMAN. It would be a most interesting fact.

MR. WHITE. There are about 1,469,000 shares outstanding in which Castle & Cook and Waialua own just about half. I think the next largest stockholder would own about 20,000 shares, and he is a relatively new stockholder, so that your average stockholding, eliminating those two, would be quite small, maybe in the neighborhood of 150 to 200 shares of stock.

THE CHAIRMAN. Would you be good enough to look into the record and file a statement for the committee showing the average stockholding and the so-called medium stockholding, that is to say what is the amount of stock held by the stockholders owning the least amount of shares per capita.

Mr. WHITE. I can do that very easily. A lot of the stock is held by our employees, I mean in all levels of employment.

(The following letter was subsequently received re ownership of the Hawaiian Pineapple Co.):

MAY 3, 1950.

Hon. Joseph C. O'MAHONEY,

*Chairman, Committee on Insular and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: You have requested that I furnish you with information relative to the ownership and average holdings of certain shareholders of Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Ltd. This data, obtained by telephone from the stock transfer agents of the company in Honolulu, reflects the situation as of February 15, 1950, the last record date for dividend payments and is as follows:

	<i>Shares</i>
Castle & Cook, Ltd.-----	236, 500
Helemano Co., Ltd.-----	500, 000
Total -----	736, 500
All other stockholders-----	748, 438
Grand total-----	1, 484, 938

There were 5,861 shareholders as of February 15, 1950, so that the average holding per shareholder was 273.36 shares. If the holdings of Castle & Cook, Ltd., and Helemano Co., Ltd., are eliminated, the remaining 5,859 shareholders owned an average of 127.74 shares each.

Respectfully submitted.

HENRY A. WHITE,
President, Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Ltd.

The CHAIRMAN. Do any of those famous Hawaiian trusts own any of this?

Mr. WHITE. Hawaiian trust represents a lot of stockholders in the Hawaiian Pineapple Co. They vote either in a fiduciary capacity or under proxies or powers of attorney that they may hold. The Hawaiian trust has no direct hold.

I think that the pineapple industry is typical of industries in Hawaii, and my company is fairly typical of the other pineapple companies. The industry is the second largest in the islands. It employs many thousands of people the year around, and many thousands more during the summer peak seasons. The Hawaiian pineapple industry supplies about 70 percent of the requirements of the American market for pineapple. My company, like the typical pineapple company in Hawaii, is marked by a high degree of American scientific know-how.

The pineapple industry in Hawaii is very important to the American consumer. Ideal climate for the growth of pineapple in Hawaii produces a high quality, richly flavored fruit, probably unexcelled throughout the world. Our only limitation on expanded production is land on which to grow more pineapple to meet the increasing demands.

Our employees are paid well, with rates on our plantations and in our cannery ranging from \$1.01 an hour to \$1.86 an hour for men, and \$0.91 an hour to \$1.325 an hour for women. In addition to these high rates of pay, Hawaiian Pineapple Co. provides relatively stable employment, a fact which is not generally found in agricultural and canning industries. The work opportunities are excellent the year round for our regular employees, and the take-home pay is correspondingly good. I might say that the average hourly earnings of our employees would probably run over \$1.20 an hour.

The company which I head provides many employee benefits and services. We did so before employees were organized. In addition to the benefits required by law, such as Federal insurance, workmen's compensation and unemployment insurance, we have provided other benefits which cost us about a million and a half dollars per year. We have a contributory pension plan. We have group insurance. We have paid vacations. We have medical benefits and services, including an annual free medical and eye examination. We have a liberal sick pay plan.

We have an extensive sports program, including softball, bowling, basketball, volley ball, and so on. We have Christmas and harvest parties and other recreational activities.

We carry on an extensive informational program with our employees on the theory that a well-informed employee is the best employee. We are, for example, right now in the process of transporting more than 3,000 regular employees—1,500 of them by airplane—to see other parts of the pineapple company operations. While this will cost the company more than \$50,000, we consider this to be a sound investment in good human relations.

I mention these things because in the heat of labor difficulties in the past, loose charges have been thrown around which might lend those without time to investigate closely, to regard Hawaii's normal employee-employer relations in a more unfavorably light than that which actually exists. These relations have been subjected to the same stresses and strains as industry elsewhere. Solutions to these problems have, however, been worked out with a harmony consonant with the national scene.

We in Hawaii feel that there is a certain amount of injustice in placing upon our shoulders the full blame for any Communist problems in Hawaii and for much of our labor troubles.

These problems flow out of the west coast situation. During the disastrous waterfront strike, our problems would not have been half so great were it not for the fact that the entire west coast closed down on shipments and handling of goods to and from Hawaii.

It is difficult for the islands to work out its own problems when those emanating from the mainland are imposed as an added burden during period of labor difficulty.

Businesses sit down and negotiate with the unions regularly in Hawaii, and regularly settle their own affairs with the unions. Even during times of great stress, we are able to handle our own problems unless outside complications enter. My own company, for example, suffered a strike in 1947. It ended in 5 days, and settlement of differences were embodied in a union contract.

I might say too that at the time the strike was called, it was called at the height of the season, and still they were not able to successfully enforce their demands at that time, which were unreasonable, and we decided that we were going to stand on principle even at the risk of losing our entire summer crop, which in our case probably would have cost our company \$10,000,000.

After 5 days the men came back to work, and when they came back to work, they took less than they would have had if they had accepted the company's original proposition.

We in Hawaii are now confronted with a serious economic problem due to a combination of postwar readjustment problems. The

waterfront strike, the reduction of armed forces in Hawaii, and the cut-back of civilian personnel working for the armed services.

The latter problems are largely due to moves by the Federal Government, and in this connection, I feel justified in saying that the Federal Government has failed to recognize its responsibilities to the Territory of Hawaii. Moreover, while I do not consider myself qualified to speak from the standpoint of military strategy, I believe that, in case of emergency, we might very well find ourselves in the same unprepared position with which we were confronted right after "Pearl Harbor."

In case you are interested, I have on hand a detailed picture of this situation as worked out by the Hawaiian Economic Foundation.

In the immediate sense it would not be correct to state the pineapple industry stands to gain in a shift from Territory to State.

However, the interests of those who engage in pineapple production are identical with those of the entire community. What is good for Hawaii and its people is good, in the long run, for pineapple producers.

Our interest springs from consciousness of this fact, from our sense of privilege and obligation to support these moves which will represent the greatest good for the greatest number of Hawaii's citizens.

As all of you have read and heard, the recent, and very ably conducted investigation into subversive activity in Hawaii has demonstrated that such activity is the work of a very small and highly unsuccessful—certainly untypical—group in Hawaii. As a layman, I think the committee has done an outstanding job.

We in Hawaii have much of the spirit which marked the early pioneer days. We are strong fighters against tyranny and injustice in any form, and anyone who doubts for one moment the futility and frustration which subversive activity has met in Hawaii should come out and get to know us.

The people of Hawaii are essentially a peace-loving people. They have absorbed in part the gentle character of the Hawaiians who first inhabited the islands, and the hospitality for which Hawaiians have always been noted, but we shall rise to fight whenever and wherever it may be required to protect democracy and its heritage of inherent rights. The troops recruited from Hawaii during World War II, decorated for heroism time and time again, are a splendid example of our willingness to fight with loyalty and devotion for the principles of freedom.

For half a century now we in Hawaii have worked toward statehood. We know we deserve it. It is long overdue. To my knowledge, no valid reason has ever been put forth why we should not have it, immediately. We therefore respectfully, but strongly, urge that you extend to us our basic right.

I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. White, what is this report of the Hawaiian Economic Foundation to which you referred?

Mr. WHITE. Well, that has to do primarily with the reduction of civilian personnel by the armed forces in the Territory.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you leave a copy for the use of the committee?

Mr. WHITE. I will. I will leave two copies here for you.

The CHAIRMAN. I will not make them a part of the record, but will file them for the use of the committee. Thank you very much.

Mr. WHITE. That will give you some idea. It shows there that the increase in our unemployment problem has been largely influenced by the reduction in civilian personnel in Hawaii.

It shows that as the Federal payroll was reduced by approximately 12,000, that our unemployment went up from about five to thirty thousand.

The CHAIRMAN. As the head of this company, you are in a very excellent position to testify with respect to economic conditions in the islands. Your experience is most intimate with that phase of the conditions there. What do you care to say about the unemployment problem as you now find it in the islands?

Mr. WHITE. Well, as I point out in the statement there, the unemployment problem is really a combination of three things.

The postwar adjustment was inclined to shrink that community down to its proper size because it was blown up like a balloon during the war, in order to service the Army and Navy out there, plus all the other governmental agencies that we have.

That, coupled with two bad strikes, one on the west coast and one in Hawaii, have aggravated that, and then right on top of that just at about the time when we were trying to catch our breath, why, the Government comes along and lops off the employment at Pearl Harbor and other civilian activities down there, so that we do have a serious unemployment problem. I might say that in my opinion we just have too many people for our economy to support.

The CHAIRMAN. That is precisely what I wanted you to amplify on. In other words, what are the prospects for the creation of opportunities for employment in Hawaii from now on?

Mr. WHITE. Well, the immediate prospects, Mr. Chairman, I would say are not what I would term "bright."

On the other hand, I think that we have the ingenuity and intelligence to solve that problem, but it is not one that can be solved readily because of the limitations that there are on the crops that we can grow.

Some of these things that you speak of, that one of the earlier witnesses mentioned, flowers, they will bring in a lot of money, but it does not provide much in the way of employment, because that is the type of industry which can be developed as a sort of backyard industry. I think that that also might apply to some of the other crops that have been mentioned like papayas.

The manpower requirements to grow papayas, to develop a sizable volume and distribution for the mainland, would not take much in the way of manpower. As I view the thing, it has got to be a combination of a lot of small things that are going to help to build that up.

The CHAIRMAN. You have pointed out very clearly and accurately that agricultural growth in the islands is limited by reason of temperature, geographical location, area involved, and the like. My question is what in your judgment is the likelihood that new industries of any kind can be developed in Hawaii?

You have exploited sugar growing about as far as it can be exploited probably. The same is probably true with respect to the pineapple industry, is it not?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. So what is the outlook?

Mr. WHITE. Well, I would say there are probably three or four things that show promise, the macadamia-nut industry, macadamia nuts I think can be developed very substantially. They can never be, because of land limitations——

The CHAIRMAN. I received some of them at Christmas time and I can recommend them.

Mr. WHITE. They can never be developed to a point where they would be considered competitive with a lot of nuts that they would have to compete with on a volume basis. On the other hand, that can add materially in helping out this situation.

There again it takes 10 years for a macadamia growth to come into full bearing, so in the meantime you have to plow many millions of dollars into an orchard to develop that.

The other is papaya. Now papaya is a very healthful and a very nutritious product high in vitamins, and I believe that it has possibilities of being developed, but there again it is an acquired taste and would require considerable work in market research and also in promotional activity, but you could build up volume to say that it was going to represent a substantial amount.

The other one and the important one, and I think that it may well prove to be among the the top, is the tourist industry. I think Hawaii has all of the advantages which would attract tourists, and when you attract them, that new money coming in of course turns over six or seven times, and there is nothing better than that kind of money in a community.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me say for the record, Mr. White, that I have never seen greater and more beautiful scenic attractions anywhere in the world than in Hawaii, except in Jackson Hole, Wyo. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHITE. I have not been there, so I cannot really compare them.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions, Senator?

Senator BUTLER. You were born and raised in the islands?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, I was.

Senator BUTLER. Have you always been an ardent enthusiast for statehood, Mr. White?

Mr. WHITE. I have.

Senator BUTLER. Do you see any danger to the situation affecting Hawaii in the announcement I think that came out either Friday or Saturday with reference to the reorganization of what I will term the Harry Bridges group of unions, all of his west-coast group, the Hawaiian group, and the Alaskan group?

Now up to date, there has been no official connection I know between any one of the two, but, since the CIO took action expelling certain unions, it seems that Harry Bridges is interested in taking them all under his wing and reorganizing now in a much bigger way than he has been organized heretofore. Are you familiar at all with that set-up?

Mr. WHITE. Well, I am familiar with the activities of Mr. Bridges and his union generally, but I do not look with any concern on Mr. Bridges' activities as far as Hawaii is concerned.

I think we have demonstrated that we understand the underlying value of good industrial relations, and I think that while we have had some labor unrest down there, on the whole I think all of us have benefited from it.

As far as the bulk of industry down there is concerned, our company in particular—I can speak about it better because I am more familiar with it—has had all of these so-called security provisions that the union is after. We had them before we were ever organized. We were never organized by labor until 1945, and the only reason, in my opinion, that we were ever organized—and I am not opposed to organization. Since we have had the benefits of working with a union, I favor having a union.

I would much prefer working with a better leadership than the ILWU provides, but nevertheless I would hate to see a situation develop where we did not have a union, because I think the union has done a lot of good in calling to our attention petty types of grievances which were contrary to our established policies, but which never came to our attention simply because we did not have the machinery set up where grievances could be presented in a formal manner.

Now I have no concern except from one standpoint, whether in the efforts of some of them they feel because of Mr. Bridges' conviction, that they may try to dislodge that type of leadership. If the A. F. of L., the teamsters, or some branch of Mr. Murray's union should come down there, I think we probably would take a beating for awhile in the way of jurisdictional disputes, and those things are very unfortunate. As far as actually handling our labor situation is concerned, I have no fear at all.

Senator BUTLER. You have been pretty much a victim of Bridges when he was just in charge of the west coast.

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Senator BUTLER. When you people were not even on strike, but you could not get your stuff over and handled along the west coast.

Mr. WHITE. Well, on the other hand, while the strike was on in Honolulu, we carried on our operations fully.

The one difficulty we had was when we endeavored to ship 115,000 cases of tidbits up to California for processing into fruit cocktail, because you cannot have fruit cocktail without pineapple—if you do not have pineapple it becomes fruit mix and the consumer just does not want it, so it is an essential ingredient for fruit cocktail.

Well, we were not too successful. We spent a lot of money in getting pineapple to the west coast, but we finally got it there and got our cocktail.

Senator BUTLER. Well, I was anxious to get your reaction on what you might think would be the result with Bridges in control of not only the west coast but of the ILWU and the unions in Alaska.

Mr. WHITE. Well, I do not think it will have any different effect on us because as a matter of fact good industrial relations stem from your working constantly with your employees, and that is what we are doing.

Senator BUTLER. I think you have done a good job.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. White. The committee is very much obliged to you for your statement.

The next witness will appear at our later session. Who will it be?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Ernest W. Greene, representing the sugar industry.

The CHAIRMAN. This afternoon we will assemble at 2:30. Senator Taylor will preside. The committee stands in recess until 2:30 this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 1:10 p. m., the hearing was recessed to reconvene at 2:30 p. m. this same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Senator TAYLOR. The committee will come to order. Mr. Greene, will you come forward, sir?

STATEMENT OF ERNEST W. GREENE, VICE PRESIDENT, HAWAIIAN SUGAR PLANTERS' ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. GREENE. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am Ernest W. Greene, vice president of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association.

The association which I represent has on a number of occasions adopted resolutions and has offered testimony advocating statehood for Hawaii before committees of both Houses of Congress, sitting both in Hawaii and in Washington.

It would seem unnecessary at this time to repeat the arguments and statements that have been made on the subject. On March 23 of this year—a little more than a month ago—the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association reaffirmed its position as originally outlined in a resolution dated January 2, 1946, and instructed me to present it to this committee. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the people of Hawaii for half a century during the time of the monarchy and of the Republic of Hawaii, maintained and upheld constitutional government and experienced the responsibilities of full national citizenship; and

Whereas during all times since these islands were annexed to the United States the people of this Territory have maintained orderly and efficient government in the manner prescribed by the Organic Act of Hawaii, and are now prepared to assume the responsibilities of complete American citizenship; and

Whereas the people of Hawaii have shown their unflagging loyalty to the Stars and Stripes, some in combat on the battlefields of Europe and the Pacific, and others as civilians on the home front; and

Whereas the finances and economic conditions of the Territory are in a sound position and are fully up to the requirements of statehood; and

Whereas the industries of this Territory are entitled to full advantage of national legislation and administration which will protect their interests from unfair discrimination; and

Whereas the people of this Territory have demonstrated their capacity for self-government and are entitled to receive full American citizenship; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the trustees of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, That it is their conviction that the time has now come when the Territory of Hawaii should be admitted to statehood in the American Union.

That is the resolution. I would like to add that I lived and worked in Hawaii for many years before I moved to Washington 13 years ago. I have continued in close touch with the sugar industry which it is my privilege to represent, as well as with other business in the Territory.

I believe that Hawaii should now be admitted as a State, and it is my personal hope that this committee will take prompt and favorable action on the legislation which is now before you. It is my opinion that a great majority of the business community in Hawaii likewise are in favor of statehood.

Senator TAYLOR. Are there any questions, Senator Ecton?

Senator ECTON. How many members do you have in this organization which you represent?

Mr. GREENE. We have 28 sugar-producing members, being all of the sugar plantations of Hawaii. We have a number of individual members who belong as individuals, just as I do. But the basis of the association is that it is an agricultural cooperative, composed of all of the sugar producers in the Territory of Hawaii.

Senator ECTON. Does this operate just on what I call the mainland of Hawaii, or do you have representatives on some of the other islands?

Mr. GREENE. You mean within the Territory?

Senator ECTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. GREENE. The sugar is produced on four islands of the Territory: The islands of Oahu, Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai. The membership of the association is distributed among those islands.

I do not have the percentage figures here, but it would vary from 21 to 28 percent of the sugar crop produced on each of the four islands, with producer members on each of those islands.

The headquarters of the association are in the city of Honolulu.

Senator ECTON. Has there been any time in the history of your organization when you did not support statehood?

Mr. GREENE. The support of statehood by the organization, as such—that is, by the association—is a matter of record of more recent years. Like every other group in the Territory, we had some, like myself—and you heard Mr. White testify this morning—who have been in favor of statehood for a great many years. We have others who have come to that belief gradually.

We have some who sincerely hold other views. But I believe that the great majority of people—certainly those that I know something about in my own line of work in the sugar industry—are in favor of statehood, and certainly this resolution passed our executive committee unanimously.

Senator ECTON. There is every indication that you made progress in recent years on it, anyway.

Mr. GREENE. Yes, sir.

Senator ECTON. Do you have a unanimous report?

Mr. GREENE. To the best of my knowledge, that was passed unanimously by the executive committee. They sent this on with instructions that I present it as the view of the sugar producers for whom they are authorized to speak.

As I said in my statement, I was instructed to present that resolution to this committee. It is not an overnight resolution, as indicated by the fact that it is a reaffirmation of a resolution originally passed on January 2, 1946, in anticipation of certain hearings held in the Territory.

Senator TAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Greene.

Mr. FARRINGTON. The next witness is Mr. Urban E. Wild, president of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu.

STATEMENT OF URBAN E. WILD, PRESIDENT, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF HONOLULU, T. H.

Mr. WILD. I am Urban E. Wild, born in Cedar Falls, Iowa, educated in college and preparatory schools and afterward in law school on the continental mainland of the United States, going to Hawaii

about 33 years ago. I have made Hawaii my home ever since. I am president of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, and I have prepared a very brief statement which I would like to ask your indulgence for me to read.

Senator TAYLOR. Proceed.

Mr. WILD. For more than 50 years of tutelage as a Territory under the American flag the people of Hawaii have demonstrated, by their loyalty and their ability, the right to full privileges of American citizenship through statehood now.

The Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, celebrating in 1950 its one hundredth anniversary, has for years been advocating statehood for Hawaii. In 1946 a member poll on the question "Are you in favor of statehood for Hawaii?" resulted in a vote of 3 to 1 in favor of statehood for Hawaii.

Representatives of this chamber have appeared before congressional committees visiting in Hawaii to investigate on the question of statehood. Representatives of the chamber have appeared in Washington, D. C., to testify in behalf of statehood for Hawaii.

Two years ago, at their annual meeting in Washington, D. C., the Chamber of Commerce of the United States adopted a resolution in support of statehood for Hawaii.

The Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, by action of its board of directors, authorize me to urge support of statehood for Hawaii now.

We submit herewith a copy of the 1949 issue—just off the press a week ago Tuesday—of Hawaii Facts and Figures, published by the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, which supplies factual data on Hawaii which we trust will be helpful. (The booklet referred to above is on file with the committee.)

This is one of a number of pamphlets that have been prepared over the years by the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, and the source of the information given is shown in the annotations. Every effort is made to make it concretely factual, without expression of opinion unless it is stated to be opinion or position.

We trust that this little booklet will be of assistance in portraying Hawaii as it exists socially, economically, racially, and in every other way.

Might I ask the indulgence of the committee to make a personal statement, not as president of the chamber?

Senator TAYLOR. Certainly. We will be happy to hear from you.

Mr. WILD. I have studied this question of statehood over a long period of time. One of the first great difficulties, apparently taken as a difficulty by everyone with whom I discussed the problem, was the large percentage of our population that derived from races of Asiatic origin.

Thinking the matter over carefully, dispassionately, viewing the United States as a country built up of persons deriving from all races, but largely European, on the continental mainland of the United States, I think I had to come to the conclusion, as I believe you gentlemen have, that one of our great strengths as a Nation has been the fact that we have embraced within our citizenry citizens who derived from all the nations of Europe.

They understand, and there are some in our population who understand, intimately the problems of the population of this country and Europe.

So viewed, I suddenly bethought myself: With this enormous population in Asia, should not we strengthen the United States, and is not there strength in Hawaii that we have a large percentage of population who have demonstrated that they are patriotic American citizens. They fought, bled, and died for the United States and had been crippled and blinded for the United States, and they believe in the democratic way of life.

Isn't it an advantage now to have an insight through their eyes into the problems of teeming Asia? And won't it strengthen the United States to have that insight more intimately brought into our national picture?

I have thrashed that question out, and I have answered it truthfully and honestly to myself. I believe that Hawaii, if for no other reason than that background of races and its demonstrated capacity for self-government, can add much of thought and understanding to the problems of the world—they are not just European problems any more—if Hawaii comes in as a State. And we have Senators and Representatives who can vote and can serve widely on committees.

Of course, we have the voice in Congress—we have a Delegate—but there is so much business, gentlemen, before this august body that one man cannot just possibly attend to it, and that is true in the Senate and the House.

There is another thing. I know when I was a little boy in Iowa we always looked to Europe. What were the problems in Europe. Those were the things that seemed to affect us. After this last war, when we had what we deemed and called a "cold war" with Russia, we were all looking to Europe, except we people of Honolulu, and we were looking with grave concern at the Asiatic picture as it changed, as it became more and more a perilous picture, and we felt that it was high time that we looked both ways—through the eyes of those of Asiatic origin and with their advice and with their service, who can understand those people, and how to deal with the problems that are developing in this modern world.

I felt, therefore, and I am satisfied, therefore, that what I at first blush thought to be a weakness—and I am much surprised to see some other witnesses seeming to apologize for that situation; I would not think of apologizing for that any more than I would for the fact that we had people who derived from Swedish, German, Polish, and other races—Italian and all the rest of the European races in the United States. They have made the United States strong.

There is one other thing. It may be that we are far too concerned over safety. After all, we are a bastion of defense for western continental United States. I daresay that no nation in the world could ever conquer the Pacific coast, leaving Hawaii undefeated in its wake, because as a bomber base, as an air-carrier base, as a base to push forward in war we would be too vitally in the heart of their operations.

I feel that one of the great additional considerations which two Senators and two Representatives from Hawaii could give would be in exchanging their views with you gentlemen for a little stronger share of defense in the Pacific.

I feel strongly that the defense of the Pacific should go no lower than it has. I feel that it should be augmented, perhaps, at the expense of some other areas, where the threat does not seem to be so immediate.

Frankly, gentlemen, that view may be wrong. But I believe in the free exchange of thoughts on that matter; that there will be a result, and that the result will be that you gentlemen in passing upon those matters, both of appropriations and studying the allocation of the great military, naval, and air forces of the United States, would, I think, feel and derive a benefit from the advice of Senators and Representatives of Hawaii, in a factual manner, would study and present facts bearing upon their honest conclusions. I feel that very strongly, gentlemen.

As far as communism goes, gentlemen, I would really be worried if we had no great problems to face. The real time of national danger is the so-called golden age. The time when we arm ourselves and steel ourselves to carry on as citizens is the time when we have a challenge; when we know what that challenge is. I believe in the American way we are conquering communism in Hawaii.

It would certainly be to my great regret if 40, 400, or 1,400 Communists in the Territory of Hawaii, such a small minority, could successfully prevent Hawaii from attaining statehood, to which I believe its history shows that it is entitled.

Thank you gentlemen.

Senator TAYLOR. Do you have any questions, Senator Ecton?

Senator ECTON. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the people in Hawaii have amply demonstrated their patriotism. I do not think there is anybody in this country who has ever questioned it.

Many do wonder just how any more representation here would help you and the United States to better fortify Hawaii. After all, when Pearl Harbor happened, you happened to have the greatest potential striking power in the form of an Air and Navy armada right there in your harbor. Yet, despite all those precautions and that concentration of striking power, you were attacked.

I think you would really have something if you could just show some way that, had you had two United States Senators here, there would not have been a Pearl Harbor.

I do not think you believe that that would have made any difference, and I do not believe that the rest of us believe that.

Mr. WILD. I am not so sure about that, sir.

The news was in Washington that Pearl Harbor, or some place, was about to be attacked. I think that historic record speaks for itself. I believe further that we are now aware that nations may, by precipitate action, strike before any declaration of war is made.

I believe also, fully, that we have cut our armed forces in the Philippines down practically to zero, naturally, and that our armed forces in Hawaii have been cut down a little too far.

I believe, in other words, with one or two or probably three more mobile carriers, with a skeleton base for ship repair kept in shape in Hawaii, with a little more augmentation to our defenses there, that even if we were struck again we could not be defeated.

I think that, of course, is a matter for armed forces. But I do believe that with Senators and Representatives we would have four voices and four votes instead of just one voice.

We are a bastion. You must realize that when and if the next war starts we are going to be one of the first places shot up. Let us admit it.

Senator ECTON. I believe it. I do not want you to misunderstand my comments, Mr. Wild, because certainly you people in Hawaii do not need to make any apology ever the way you reacted to the Pearl Harbor incident. It was most commendable. You rallied to your own defense and the defense of practically the entire world. You need never feel that anybody blamed Hawaii or the people in Hawaii.

That mistake was made right here in Washington. There is no question about it. Perhaps if you had had more representation here in the Congress, there could have been certain facts brought out as to what was going on in the Orient, and as to how the possibility of an attack might be forthcoming on Hawaii. I do not know. I am asking you what you think about it.

Mr. WILD. Sir, I believe that we in Hawaii felt that war was in the offing.

Senator ECTON. I am sure you sensed it there even before it was sensed here.

Mr. WILD. Long before. We would see these boats loaded with scrap iron going to Japan. We believed that that scrap iron was going to come back to us in bombs and bullets, not in the way it did, but we felt that some day we would have to meet it coming back.

I made a speech in April of that year in which I practically inferred we would have war. I came to the coast. My wife was on the coast just meeting someone refugeeing from Europe. I expected that war might break out before I got back. Of course I did not anticipate that sort of thing.

Frankly, gentlemen, had we had two Senators and two Representatives, they would have assigned one of them to just go after the highest source of intelligence in Washington, because they would have been concerned over their safety, and our safety.

Of course, things may have happened exactly as they did. I am not saying they would not. But I am quite certain—and your question brings out this point—as our eyes are on Asia, much of the continental United States' eyes were on Europe.

Our eyes were on Asia, and we felt that peril, and we would have tion brings out this point—as our eyes were on Asia, much of the congress and to the officers of the United States Government. And I believe that were that awareness—and I have always believed—we would have gotten facts sooner than we ever did.

We have learned a great lesson militarily through the attack on Pearl Harbor. Curiously enough, I was on the shores of Pearl Harbor a few weeks—a little over 2 weeks after that attack. The *Utah* an old training ship, was turned over in the berth of an air carrier. On the map, the Japanese little map, which you have seen undoubtedly in those lectures, she was marked as an air carrier, and she was spotted. That air carrier was out of the harbor, as you know. We have learned, and the Navy has learned, how to protect itself in those clinches. I believe that the arguments and the pressure by two Senators and two Representatives here for augmentation of those forces in the Pacific Ocean area will be helpful not only for Hawaiian security but for national security.

I am as certain as I am that I am sitting here that had Hawaii been crushed, the Pacific coast would have been open for an attack and our Navy would have had a much harder, bloodier, costlier task

to protect forward forces going to Asia, and perhaps we would not have won the war yet.

Senator ECKON. I do not think there is any question but what your statement is correct.

Mr. WILD. In truth, I never want to see that situation occur again when, because of lack of foresight, lack of everything humanly possible, Hawaii could fall. And I feel that we will be one of the first places attacked. That is why I call it a bastion of defense.

Senator TAYLOR. Senator Anderson?

Senator ANDERSON. It is too bad that Belgium did not have two United States Senators, if we can prevent attacks that easily.

Mr. WILD. Had Belgium had the power of the United States military might behind her, and had the forces of the United States been deployed in Belgium as they were on D-day, Belgium never would have fallen. I think we have to concede that.

Senator ANDERSON. How many areas can you defend that way? What about some of the other countries?

Mr. WILD. Belgium is not an object for which the United States is responsible in defense. Belgium, as I view it, is not an outpost of the United States, protecting the United States.

My only point is that here we have a Territory of the United States—mind you, an independent nation ceding its sovereignty to the United States by voluntary treaty—which is an integral part of the United States, and which it is the duty of the United States to defend. But in defending Hawaii, you are defending the United States and its west coast.

So I fail to see that the Belgium situation would make any difference, although I do believe that we could have defended Belgium had we had the might of the United States and two Senators and two Representatives behind it.

Senator ANDERSON. I am merely trying to suggest that an attacking group does not stop to ask whether there are two Senators or two Congressmen there, or anything else.

Mr. WILD. Of course not. But the preparation may cause the attacking group not to attack.

I do not want to go far into the military matters because I do not purport to be a military expert. I am stating the position of business. But I am also stating my own view on that matter.

Senator TAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Wild. We enjoyed your testimony.

Mr. FARRINGTON. The next witness is Mr. Spark M. Matsunaga, of the veteran One Hundredth Infantry.

Senator TAYLOR. Is he one of the famous group who fought in Italy?

Mr. FARRINGTON. He is a disabled veteran from Hawaii and at present studying law at Harvard Law School.

Senator TAYLOR. We have read about your group and admired their courage and resourcefulness.

STATEMENT OF SPARK MASAYUKI MATSUNAGA, HONOLULU, T. H.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Thank you, sir.

As it is no doubt made apparent by my physical appearance, I am an American of Japanese descent. Both of my parents migrated to

Hawaii from Japan more than half a century ago, and I have never since returned to Japan, not even for a visit. I was born and educated in Hawaii, and have lived there all my life, except for about 4½ years—3 years while in service with the Army and 1½ years since enrolling at the Harvard Law School in Cambridge, Mass., at which institution I am now a student.

I am a disabled veteran of World War II, having been twice wounded in combat in Italy while serving with the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion. I volunteered for service in July 1941, 6 months prior to Pearl Harbor, and was discharged as captain in December 1945, after 4½ years of active service. I am a past commander of the Disabled American Veterans of Hawaii, a chapter of the national organization.

When I was asked to appear before this committee, I readily consented, because I was compelled by a sense of duty which I strongly feel I owe, not so much to the people in Hawaii who anxiously await a favorable report by this committee, but more to those comrades of the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion and the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team who today lie silently beneath mounds of earth.

It is the memory of those men which has compelled me to come before you today, to testify in their behalf that they might be given full recognition for the supreme sacrifice which they made for us and our country.

To some of us these at first may seem but the words of a sentimentalist to which members of a civilized, intellectual society such as ours should pay no heed. To such members among us, let it be pointed out that our society has been preserved through the years not by immobile intellectuals, but by those sentimentalists who chose to die for those ideals inherent in our democratic way of life.

The record of the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion and the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team has no doubt been placed before you. Together they formed what has been described by Gen. Mark Clark as "the most decorated unit in the entire military history of the United States." They amassed 10 unit awards, including 7 Presidential unit citations—that is a modification of the modest figure given this morning by Senator Sukyana; he stated there were 5; there were 7—and over 5,000 individual awards, including 3,600 Purple Heart Medals with 500 oak-leaf clusters, 810 Bronze Star Medals with 38 oak-leaf clusters, 15 Soldiers' Medals, 17 Legion of Merit Medals, 342 Silver Star Medals with 12 oak-leaf clusters, 1 Distinguished Service Medal, 47 Distinguished Service Crosses, and 1 Congressional Medal of Honor.

Senator TAYLOR. How many men were involved in this?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. About 3,600.

In connection with these awards, I could relate innumerable accounts of individual heroism—of men who have been decorated and of men who despite performing heroic deeds have gone into the great beyond without wordly recognition—stories that are grim and stories that are even funny. I would prefer at this time, however, to answer the question which has been most frequently asked of me concerning the one-hundredth and four hundred and forty-second: "What was it that made the one-hundredth and the four hundred and forty-second fight so hard?"

Rev. Joseph T. Walker, formerly a chaplain with the Thirty-fourth Infantry Division, now retired, answered this question before an audience of American officers by saying: "While we are only 100 percent Americans, the men of the One-hundredth Infantry Battalion are 200 percent Americans." I will not make such claims, but I can honestly and sincerely say this: while fighting for the same ideals as any other American was fighting for, at the same time every man in the one-hundredth and the four hundred and forty-second was in addition fighting to prove to the world that despite his racial ancestry he was as loyal an American as any, as loyal as any, and deserved the right to be called an American. That was the driving force behind our men which led them to achieve such an enviable record in American military history.

I have had the unforgettable experience of having watched fellow Americans die on the field of battle—men with whom I played as kids, men with whom I had attended school, men with whom I had lived and fought through mud and snow, men whom I had learned to love and to respect. The memory of having watched them die has haunted me and will continue to haunt me, not so much that they were buddies of mine, but because so many of them in their last few words on earth, even as they lay mortally wounded on the ground, told me in effect, "Well, sir, I do hope that as a result of my dying, you and those returning home, and our folks back there will have a better life."

It is often said, even by men with combat experience, that while at the front a soldier forgets about ideals and fight only for self-preservation. I can truthfully state, however, that those men whom I saw die at the front did die for ideals—died so that those whom they left behind would have a better life and might enjoy the full status of American citizenship despite their racial ancestry.

True, like other GI's, we talked of the ordinary things of life, for during the lull of battle we often got together and talked of our family members, of our next door neighbor, of the corner drug store, of the "good ole chocolate sundae" we wished we could have one more of, of the Sunday matinee, of the ball games, and of the "cute little 'gal' back home that was so crazy about me," but invariably our conversation centered about the way and the peace that was to follow.

Most of the men expressed great hopes for the future. They were hopeful because they felt deep within themselves that as a result of their sacrifices at the front, Americans back home would come to recognize them as plain Americans and not hyphenated Americans. They were especially hopeful because while at the front, where a man meant what he said and where superficiality was nonexistent, men of the Thirty-fourth Infantry Division and of other units which fought alongside us used to come up to us and say, "I am proud to be an American, because you are an American."

And times were many, when rations were meager, when they willingly, cheerfully, voluntarily, offered their chocolate bars, cigarettes and water, with the words "Here, take it, you will need it more than I will."

But above all, we found greatest hope in the fact that man of other units were willingly risking their lives for us. On one occasion, when our battalion ran into some difficulty and was about to be encircled by the enemy, a regimental commander of the Thirty-fourth

Division, in issuing attack orders to his command said, "Men, the One-hundredth is in trouble up there—we must get to them."

The men of the regiment fought as they had never fought before, and did get to us. Incidents of individual soldiers of other units giving up their lives to save the lives of our men were numerous. I can say from my own experience that a Sergeant Thompson gave up his life for me. As I lay wounded in a field strewn with mines and under heavy mortar fire, Sergeant Thompson, despite my warnings against it, tried to come to me. In doing so he stepped on a telemine and was blown to bits. I could not determine where he was from, or who he was. He was from a paratroop outfit that had been dropped before our advance, and was guiding the battalion in its attack. But I will always think of him as one who laid down his life for me.

It was in men like Thompson and in the close comradeship we developed with men of other units that we found our greatest source of encouragement and hope for the future. We felt in our association with them that they thought the same thoughts and felt the same sentiments. We learned through them that Americans did change their minds, their attitudes even from one extreme to the other, and that they did want to understand, and that they did believe in fair play.

Many of our men, however, expressed skepticism. They were skeptical because even while at the front, we would read in the Stars and Stripes, the official Army newspaper, stories such as that of a debate held in California on the question of returning the Japanese-Americans to the west coast, in which one of the speakers remarked, "I think this business of Japanese-Americans fighting overseas is purely propaganda." You can well imagine how we felt up there in our muddy foxholes, and how the men in the evacuation hospitals felt with an arm or a leg off, or an eye out.

The skeptic also pointed to cases like that of Private Matsuda, a veteran of the One-hundredth Battalion, who was returned to the United States from Italy because of his wounds, and who, while wearing Uncle Sam's uniform with seven different decorations and walking on crutches, was thrown out of a barber shop because he wore a Japanese face.

Other incidents, such as that which I experienced on board a troopship while returning to Italy from an Army hospital in Africa strengthened the case for the skeptic. While I was on deck as a submarine lookout, an American officer approached me and said, "You know, you cannot trust these Japs, even these so-called Japanese-Americans. Once a Jap, always a Jap."

To determine the basis for a remark such as that, I asked him, "Have you had any contact with a Japanese-American?" He said, "No, but you know I read in the magazines and newspapers about them, and my friends who know many of them tell me about them."

He then looked at me with a suspicious eye and inquired, "Say, you are Chinese, are you not?" When I replied, "No, I am of Japanese descent," he let out a gasp of "No," and nearly fell over backwards.

I took it upon myself then and there to reeducate this officer and I talked with him for hours for the next 13 days—it took us that long from Africa to Italy, zig-zagging. At the end of the trip he came to

me and, shaking my hand, said, "Sparky, I have changed my mind completely about the Japanese-American; I know now what I should have known; forgive me if I hurt you any."

Because there are many well-meaning Americans who, still today, like this officer through misinformation or lack of information would discriminate against fellow Americans on account of their racial heritage, the skeptics have remained skeptical and feel that Hawaii will never be granted statehood and consequently they will never be granted the full status of American citizenship.

Even the skeptics agree, however, that when the truth finally prevails, they will not be denied their just due. Their argument is that education is such a slow process that they will have joined their fallen comrades when full recognition finally comes.

We who are optimistic by nature, on the other hand, look with encouragement to the fact that an overwhelming majority of the American people have already expressed through the various public-opinion polls, the press, the radio, and through their local and national organizations that they do favor the immediate grant of statehood to Hawaii. It is significant to note in this connection that every nationally recognized organization of war veterans has gone on record as favoring the grant of statehood to Hawaii.

It is even more significant that the Disabled American Veterans have so expressed themselves because they, more than the average American, realize the preciousness of our American heritage. Surely, a truly representative body such as this will not disregard the expressed wishes of their electors.

I am confident I speak for all veterans of World War II who reside in Hawaii when I say that the granting of statehood to Hawaii will mean to the veteran a final recognition of the great sacrifices he made in answer to the call from his country.

I beseech you, therefore, to report H. R. 49 favorably on to the Senator floor so that we might there be granted a fair opportunity to ask for our just due, a star on Old Glory which we can call our own.

I know you will not let us down.

Senator TAYLOR. Sir, I want to express my appreciation for your splendid presentation. I believe I can say truthfully that in my 6 years in the United States Senate I have heard no testimony as deeply moving as that which you have presented.

Speaking for myself, I want to say that I am proud to call you a brother American, and proud to call you brother. I do not believe anybody can doubt the fact that I am sincere in that inasmuch as at this very moment I stand convicted of disorderly conduct because I tried to go in a wrong door to address a meeting of American citizens who did not happen to be all of the same color.

Do you gentlemen have any questions?

Senator CORDON. We appreciate your statements, Mr. Matsunaga.

Senator TAYLOR. Thank you very much.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would like to call as the next witness one more veteran, Senator Ansai, of the Island of Maui, a member of the legislature, who likewise served with our troops.

STATEMENT BY TOSHIO ANSAI, MEMBER OF THE TERRITORIAL SENATE, WAILUKU, MAUI, T. H.

Mr. ANSAI. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Toshio Ansaï. I am a member of the Territorial senate from the second senatorial district, which includes the counties of Maui and Kalawao. The county of Maui includes the Island of Molokai and Lanai, also.

I am of Japanese descent, born, reared, and educated in the islands. Both of my parents are living and have been living in Hawaii for about 50 years. Both of them are 78 years old.

I am one of nine children, a Catholic, married, and have two children. I attended public school and finished at the St. Anthony School for Boys. Because of the large family and the limited income of my father, it was necessary for me to leave school at the end of the ninth grade when I was 15 years old. However, in my desire to continue my formal education, I have taken correspondence courses in accounting with the La Salle Extension University, and animal husbandry with the University of California.

I began working on the plantation as a clerk in the warehouse and have been fortunate in being able to work my way up until I reached the position which I now hold as manager of the Wailuku Sugar Co.'s dairy and ranch.

Living as I do in a small community, it was not long after leaving school before I found myself in the midst of numerous community activities. My first major activity was with the Boy Scout movement, serving in various capacities and today I am a member of the executive board of our council.

In recognition of my work for scouting and other youth activities, I received the silver beaver award in 1940. I am a charter member of the Maui Lions Club, a member of our local chamber of commerce, was a member of the board of directors of the Alexander House Community Association, served for 7 years in the National Guard of Hawaii prior to World War II, served on the executive committee of the Maui unit of the American Red Cross, the Maui Tuberculosis Association, and numerous other organizations.

Perhaps as a result of these many activities and because of my interest in public affairs, I was encouraged to enter our local politics and made my first bid for public office at the age of 26.

I was successful in being elected as one of the six members of our board of supervisors. Out of a field of 22 candidates I finished in fourth place. I was elected for a term of 2 years and reelected after that for three successive terms. During my term of office I served as chairman of the finance committee and had the responsibility of preparing and guarding our annual budget. In 1942, at the end of my fourth term as a member of the board of supervisors of the County of Maui, I did not choose to again seek reelection, because I felt that I could be of more service to the community in other activities.

About a year before the war Hawaii, like the rest of the Nation, was preparing herself to meet any emergency. Among the prewar activities in which I had some part were the following: I joined the Maui provisional police; acted as chairman of the scrap aluminum collection campaign for the Island of Maui; was a member of the emer-

gency food production committee; and was one of the zone chairmen of the office of civilian defense.

Then came the attack on Pearl Harbor, and everyone on Maui was plunged into wartime activities necessary to win the war. With the provisional police and the cowboys working with me on the ranch, we patrolled the areas which were inaccessible to motor vehicles. All of this area was open, rough terrain, and we had to patrol it on horseback. This activity was continued under my supervision until the Regulars arrived.

Later when the War Department gave the Americans of Japanese ancestry the opportunity to serve our country in the Armed Forces, I volunteered with others for active combat duty. I was then 35 years of age, married, and had one child.

We had our basic training in Mississippi and Alabama, and I soon learned that it was not easy for a man 35 years old to keep up with the vim, vigor, and vitality of 21-year-old youngsters who made up our combat team.

Being one of the oldest in our group, the boys were soon calling me "Pop" and were always willing to give "Pop" an extra lift when the going was tough. We went overseas and became part of the Thirty-fourth Infantry Division and served in the Italian campaign.

I was injured a few miles south of Florence and was hospitalized in the hospital in Rome. I was sent back to the United States and convalesced in Florida after which I returned to duty with the military intelligence school in Minnesota to assist in the combat training program of the interpreters—servicemen of Japanese ancestry being trained for combat service in the South Pacific area.

I received a letter of commendation after my discharge from the United States Army, Military Intelligence Service, for the service I rendered while there.

I am a disabled veteran. I am receiving a 10-percent disability pension from the United States Government.

I was discharged a few months after VJ-day and returned home to resume my job as manager of the dairy and ranch. Again, of course, my community activities were resumed and added to those in which I was previously interested was that of aiding and caring for the welfare of returned veterans and of bringing some aid and comfort to the families of those boys who did not return.

It was not long before I again found myself drawn into politics, and feeling that I could again be of some service and in some measure represent and protect the interest of the veterans, I entered the arena as a candidate for a seat in the Territorial senate. I was elected for a term of 4 years, which term I am now serving. As a member of the senate which convened in February 1949, I served as chairman of the Maui select committee, and was a member of the committee on ways and means, agriculture, public lands, and military.

I am now a member of the hold-over committee from the senate, serving on the subcommittees on governmental efficiency; civil service, classification and retirement; hospitals, medical care, health and welfare; and harbors, airports, and public utilities.

That, in brief, gentlemen, is my life story. I come here to speak in support of immediate statehood for Hawaii. As far as the usual arguments and reasons are concerned, I believe that I cannot add anything

more than what has already been said. But I honestly feel that you want to see for yourself, and you want to know just what kind of people comprise the population of the Territory. That seems to be the question in the minds of some of the people.

The reason why I say that is because I had the opportunity to appear before a congressional investigating committee which came to Hawaii in 1935, and again in 1937. Some of the questions that were directed to me at that time, as well as some of the statements that were brought here for the past 2 days, and even those by some of the Congressmen who spoke in behalf of statehood and for our cause, have touched on this particular subject.

I cannot help but feel that this subject has been discussed among the Congressmen. This question of the people of the Territory: Are they Americans in spirit? Are they Americans in their way of life? Are they ready to assume the responsibilities of statehood? I would like to offer myself as exhibit A, if you want to call me that, that the people of Hawaii are Americans; that they are ready for statehood now.

The brief life story that I gave of myself is not unusual. In fact, you can apply that same pattern to hundreds of other Niseis—Nisei is a term that we use meaning second generation—or you can apply the same pattern to the descendants of other racial groups.

I am one of thousands of Niseis, Americans of Japanese ancestry, who volunteered for active combat service in this last war, and I believe that our actions have proven beyond any doubt our loyalty and our devotion to the American way of life, and to the cause of democracy.

The war record of the Four hundred and Forty-second, One Hundredth Battalion, and the interpreters are an open book. It has been repeated over and over again, not by us but by those with whom we have fought and suffered together, out there in no man's land, where race, color, or creed played no part.

Today in the national cemetery in Honolulu on the hilltop of Punchbowl you see hundreds of white crosses marking the graves of the boys who fell, who made the extreme sacrifice. These boys all made the supreme sacrifice for a cause. The white crosses on the grave of all our boys in the national cemeteries and on foreign soil, stand for the same cause.

That cause is so that people like you and I and the rest of the Nation can continue to live the American way of life.

I would like to, in closing, offer myself again as a living proof that we in Hawaii are Americans; American in spirit and in our way of life as well as in name. We in Hawaii deserve statehood; we deserve it now. We, the people in Hawaii, will accept and will live up to the responsibilities that the acquisition of statehood will entail.

Thank you.

Senator TAYLOR. Are there any questions?

Senator CORDON. No, Mr. Chairman. I am glad to receive you, Mr. Ansai, as Exhibit A. That is satisfactory to me.

Senator TAYLOR. That is quite an experience.

The hearing will stand in recess until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

(Thereupon, at 3:45 p. m., the hearing was recessed until 10 a. m., May 4, 1950.)

HAWAII STATEHOOD

H. R. 49, S. 156, S. 1782

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1950

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:10 a. m., in room 224, Senate Office Building, Senator Clinton P. Anderson of New Mexico presiding.

Present: Senators Anderson of New Mexico (presiding), Taylor (Idaho), Butler (Nebraska), Cordon (Oregon), Ecton (Montana), and Malone (Nevada).

Senator ANDERSON. The committee will come to order.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Our first witness this morning is Mr. Tavares who is former Territorial attorney general, and is at present president of the Bar Association of Hawaii.

STATEMENT OF C. NILS TAVARES, PRESIDENT OF THE BAR ASSOCIATION OF HAWAII AND MEMBER OF THE STATE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. TAVARES. Mr. Chairman, concerning my background, I might mention that some of my ancestors probably greeted Captain Cook when he discovered the Hawaiian Islands, and others came from the Azores Islands, Massachusetts, Tahiti, and points farther west. I was born in, and attended the public schools of, the Territory of Hawaii, and received my bachelor of laws degree in 1925 from the University of Michigan, where, however, I am still trying to live down my reputation as a ukulele player and to be remembered rather as a hard-working law student. I am now a delegate to the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention, a member of a local Federal Loyalty Review Board, and president of the Bar Association of Hawaii.

About 15 of my 25 years of law practice have been spent as Territorial deputy attorney general, or attorney general under four different governors, two of whom were Republicans and two Democrats, or as special counsel for one or the other of the houses of our legislature. I have assisted in the drafting of a great many of our present Hawaiian laws, and in 1935 was one of the compilation commissioners who is appointed every 10 years to completely revise and compile all of our statutes. From this experience I feel justified in stating that the laws passed by our legislature compare very favorably with those of the most progressive States. For confirmation of this statement I refer you to pages 546 to 550C and pages 576 to 584

of the printed report of the Larcade subcommittee of the House Committee on Territories, Seventy-ninth Congress, which lists many of our legislative accomplishments, indicating indisputably Hawaii's ability to govern itself well.

It is interesting to note that Hawaii was the first jurisdiction in the United States to adopt in toto the recommendations of the American Bar Association with respect to the requirements for admission to the bar. The result has been a bar of high standing and ability.

Recently, when New Jersey amended its constitution so as to provide for integrated courts and an improved system for the appointment, tenure, and removal of judges, the American Bar Association Journal praised this action in an article entitled "New Jersey Goes to the Head of the Class." Hawaii had adopted most of these features in the constitution of the republic adopted in 1894. The Hawaiian Commission appointed pursuant to the Newlands resolution of annexation, which prepared the draft of the bill that became the Hawaiian Organic Act, had this to say in its report to Congress about our laws:

the Commission deems it proper to say that the people of Hawaii are capable of self-government, and have proved this by the establishment of the Republic of Hawaii and the adoption of a constitution and code of laws which will compare favorably with those of any other government, and under such constitution and laws have maintained a stable government for several years worthy of a free people.

In the debates upon the judiciary provisions of the organic act, Senator Cullom, one of the members of the Hawaiian Commission said this:

So we found the supreme court there doing business with just as much dignity, with just as much sense of honor and of duty, and apparently with just as much intelligence as the supreme court of the State of Illinois, or of Connecticut, or of any other State.

We have kept pace with this enlightened beginning in our legal and judicial system. Our legislature has authorized our supreme court to promulgate rules of civil procedure of the same type which have won such high acclaim concerning the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and we are keeping well in the forefront of the progressive jurisdictions in judicial organization and procedure. Our constitutional convention is now studying the Missouri and New Jersey plans concerning appointment, tenure, and removal of judges, and hopes to write a section on the judiciary which, if given effect by you through the passage of H. R. 49, will give us a judiciary which will at least equal in excellence the highly praised Missouri and New Jersey systems.

With reference to the question of Communist activities in Hawaii, I should like to remind you that not only the legislature, but the Bar Association of Hawaii, requested the House Un-American Activities Committee to investigate charges concerning such activities because of the extreme difficulty of securing authentic information thereon. Such investigation has now been held and has cleared the atmosphere by exposing most of the relatively small number of persons actively engaged in the Communist movement. The people are now fully alerted to the danger of such activities and can be depended upon in the next election to eliminate those known or reasonably believed to be tainted with communism, as they did in the elections for delegates to the constitutional convention.

The bar association also, in December 1949 adopted an anti-Communist resolution reading as follows:

Whereas communism as it actually operates is an international conspiracy teaching loyalty to Russia; and

Whereas the Communist movement exists in the United States, not as a political party conceived and maintained in the American tradition, but as a subversive group serving the ends of a foreign power; and

Whereas the individual Communist has no loyalty to the United States, but yields his allegiance to an alien group whose bidding he does without question; and

Whereas the American Bar Association has resolved that lawyers who aid, support, or assist the world Communist movement in the United States should not be permitted to become or remain members of that association: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Bar Association of Hawaii hereby determines and declares that any lawyer who publicly or secretly aids, supports, or assists the world Communist movement in the accomplishment of its objectives in the United States, by knowingly participating in its program, whether such lawyer be an avowed Communist or not, is unworthy of his office and should not be permitted to become or remain a member of the Bar Association of Hawaii; and, be it further

Resolved, That the secretary forward copies of this resolution to the American Bar Association and to such other persons and organizations as the president may determine.

As president of the Bar Association of Hawaii, I should also like to remind this committee of the amendments proposed by Judge Albert B. Maris, United States Judge of the Circuit Court for the Third Circuit, who was designated by the Judicial Conference of the United States to present such amendments. These amendments are needed to conform H. R. 49 to the latest revisions of the Judicial Code, to clarify Hawaii's Federal court status, and to preserve existing pension rights of Territorial judges and avoid injustice to incumbents of the bench. The bar association urges the adoption of these amendments which are believed to be noncontroversial.

There has already been developed for use of this committee by the Hawaii Statehood Commission, a statement of the benefits which might accrue to the Nation by admitting Hawaii to statehood. I attach a copy thereof to this statement. These questions have also been elaborated upon by various speakers, including Secretary of the Interior Chapman, Governor Stainback, Samuel Wilder King, Joseph R. Farrington, and others. However, I would like to present the following additional statement as to such benefits to the Nation.

First, we believe that the people of this country, and of course their chosen Senators and Representatives in this National Congress, are still imbued with those moral and spiritual principles which led the founders of this Nation, in the Declaration of Independence, to express their belief in "a decent regard for the opinions of mankind." We therefore believe that one of the benefits to come from statehood will be the moral and spiritual satisfaction that will come to the Nation from carrying out its part of a bargain that was clearly implied, and an obligation that was clearly assumed, by the annexation of Hawaii and its incorporation as an organized territory as an integral part of the United States.

Second. The United States is one great, unified Nation, of which the States are incorporated Territories form integral parts. Therefore if, as we think we have proven, statehood would benefit the new State of Hawaii and strengthen its economy, it would pro tanto strengthen and benefit the Nation of which it forms a part.

Third. The same question, as to the benefit to the Nation by the granting of statehood, could have been asked concerning the admission of every Territory heretofore admitted as a State into the Union, and it would have been difficult at the time to demonstrate in concrete terms any specific benefit that such admission would bring to the country or to the other States, yet no one today will say that the admission of any of these Territories as States was not beneficial to the United States. And I believe that the members of this committee will concede that not all the great leaders in the Senate have come from the original States or from the States with the larger populations. Perhaps, if Hawaii is admitted, it too, may some day produce great leaders like Senator Borah, of Idaho; Senator Norris, of Nebraska; Senator Pittman, of Nevada; and Senator Poindexter, of Washington, not to mention the leaders of today from some of those less densely populated Western States. In the veins of our cosmopolitan people flows the blood of men and women who emigrated from the far reaches of the world—from the Orient and the Occident—with the same pioneering spirit of adventure and courage, with the same resourcefulness and ingenuity, and with the same desire to build themselves a better environment, that inspired the early settlers of this country to spread westward and build our great Western States.

Fourth. Statehood will relieve Congress, which has its hands more than full with national and international problems of the greatest moment, of a great deal of time and effort which it must now expend in legislating on local and special matters affecting only the Territory of Hawaii which should have no place in a national legislative body.

I can sum up our position very briefly in the words of the Apostle St. Paul to the Corinthians:

When I was a child I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things.

Mr. Chairman, if we were immature politically when we were annexed, and there is some question about that, there is no question as to our maturity now. Hawaii has grown up and wants to put away its childish status of a Territory. It wants statehood now.

In closing, I would like to remind this committee of what President Dole, of the Republic of Hawaii said, when the Hawaiian flag was hauled down in Thomas Square and the Stars and Stripes ascended to take its place. He said to American Minister Sewall:

A treaty of political union having been made, and the cession formally consented to and approved by the Republic of Hawaii having been accepted by the United States of America, I now, in the interest of the Hawaiian body politic, and with full confidence in the honor, justice, and friendship of the American people, yield up to you as the representative of the Government of the United States, the sovereignty and public property of the Hawaiian Islands.

Having fulfilled every reasonable condition of statehood, and with a steadfast confidence in the honor, justice, and friendship of the American people, of whom today we form an indissoluble part, we submit to you and the members of the Senate our petition to be recognized as an equal with the States and to be permitted to assume the duties and responsibilities and receive the blessings of statehood.

(Appendix to C. Nils Tavares' prepared statement is as follows:)

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII AS IT AFFECTS THE NATIONAL INTEREST

1. *By enacting enabling legislation to make Hawaii a State, Congress will enhance our reputation as a Nation which keeps its word*

On April 30, 1900, the Congress of the United States, by incorporating the former Republic of Hawaii into the Union and endowing it with a Territorial form of government in the American tradition, promised Hawaii eventual statehood. That promise is now 50 years old and still unfulfilled. Statehood for Hawaii will uphold our reputation as a Nation which keeps its promises and meets its obligations.

2. *Statehood for Hawaii will demonstrate to the world that we still subscribe to the great principles which underlie our way of life*

Last year the Federal Bureau of Internal Revenue collected a total of \$84,330,718 in Hawaii. This exceeded the internal-revenue collections in no less than 10 States. These 10 States have 20 Senators and 17 Representatives in Congress, or 3.7 votes each. Hawaii has only one Delegate to Congress and he has no vote. Statehood for Hawaii will show that we still subscribe to the conviction that American citizens subject to taxation are entitled to a full part in the government which levies the taxes.

3. *Statehood for Hawaii will create good will for the United States in the Pacific Basin*

Except for a few insignificant islands of little population, the Territory of Hawaii is America in the Pacific. So long as we keep its people in a status of political inferiority, we lend weight to the contention that the United States denies full fellowship in our political life to Pacific peoples. Statehood for Hawaii, the point at which America comes into contact with the Orient, will do much to create good will and confidence in the United States among the peoples of the Pacific area.

4. *The granting of complete self-government to Hawaii will give the United States a State in the Pacific*

Australia and New Zealand, former colonies, are now equals in the British Commonwealth of Nations. The Philippine Islands, formerly an island possession, is now an independent republic with ties of loyalty to the United States. The islands of the Netherlands Indies, once an imperial colony, are now the Republic of Indonesia associated with Holland. Hawaii alone remains as the only significant land area in the Pacific Basin which is not yet fully associated with its "mother" country on a status of complete political equality.

5. *Statehood for Hawaii will strengthen our Union by binding it more closely together*

The Territory of Hawaii, though an integral part of the United States in a constitutional sense, nevertheless is a mere appendage to the American Union of States. Its people, though citizens of the United States and subject to the Constitution and laws of the United States, nevertheless do not enjoy political equality with the citizen-residents of the various States. As a State, Hawaii and her people will be bound more closely into the Union as equals in a union of equals.

6. *Statehood for Hawaii will help cleanse the United States of the stigma of "colonialism"*

Pursuant to the provisions of chapter XI of the Charter, the United States is required to report each year to the United Nations on the economic, social, and educational conditions in the non-self-governing territories under its jurisdiction. These are Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Thus, the United States stands with France, the Netherlands, and Great Britain, the principal old world "colonial" powers, as a nation with non-self-governing peoples under its jurisdiction. By admitting Hawaii, the most populous of our non-self-governing areas, to statehood, we will go a long way toward discrediting the charge of "colonialism."

7. *Statehood for Hawaii will help complete our progression to Territorial maturity*

In our infancy, the United States stood 13 strong on the Atlantic seaboard. Through the years we have moved steadily to the West—first to the Mississippi; next to the Rockies; then to the Pacific. Finally, in 1898, we arrived in Hawaii,

the Pacific doorstep to America. First we acquired territory; then we set up governments, creating political subdivisions of the American Union which we called Territories; finally, after a suitable period of pupilage, we brought those Territories into the Union and assimilated them as a part of our national body politic. Statehood for Hawaii (and Alaska) is a logical step toward national territorial maturity. It is historically inevitable.

8. Statehood will send to the United States Congress from Hawaii men of caliber with an intimate knowledge of the Pacific Ocean area at their fingertips

The United States is a Pacific as well as an Atlantic nation. Statehood for Hawaii will bring to the halls of Congress two Senators and two Congressmen from the crossroads of the Pacific. Their first-hand knowledge of the Pacific and their familiarity with the ways of Pacific peoples should prove a valuable asset to the Congress in the handling of its ever-increasing responsibilities in Pacific affairs.

9. Statehood for Hawaii will strengthen our Nation's defenses in the Pacific

Hawaii, either as a Territory or as a State, will continue to be a vital outpost of national defense, and her people will continue in their unfaltering loyalty to the United States. The fact remains, however, that our over-all potential for effective national defense must of necessity be strengthened when we strengthen the invisible ties which bind us together as one Nation and one people.

MR. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, we would like to call Congressman Velde who is the ranking minority member of the Un-American Activities Committee which investigated Communists in Hawaii.

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD H. VELDE, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE EIGHTEENTH DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

MR. VELDE. I am very fortunate to be able to come in and start testifying immediately, Mr. Chairman. I have a prepared statement and with your permission I will read it.

The people of Hawaii—and I believe the people of the United States—want to see this Congress act on statehood for Hawaii. The time is now, in the Eighty-first Congress.

There are various reasons why some of the Members of Congress hesitate to grant statehood to Hawaii. Many of these reasons are tied up in misinformation regarding Hawaii and its people. Because I have just recently returned from Hawaii, I would like to correct a few popular misconceptions of Hawaii and its social, economic, and political institutions.

In any discussion of Hawaii, it must be conceded at the outset that the seemingly extravagant descriptions of Hawaii's beauty are quite accurate. Hawaii is a semi-tropical paradise. The islands have been blessed by nature with a physical beauty and a climate beyond compare. It is a land of flowers and beaches, of volcanoes, snow-capped mountains, and tropical breezes. At the same time, it is a modern twentieth century American community.

The boys and girls of Hawaii study their reading and writing and arithmetic in modern American schools. They do not spend their youth playing in the sand under the coconut trees as an occasional innocent believes. They play football, basketball, and baseball as organized sports. Hawaiian boys and girls learn of literature and the arts and sciences from the same books that your children study in school. In the current year, Hawaii's 352 schools have a total enrollment of 114,143; the University of Hawaii, 4,736.

I might say that when I was there I had occasion to attend a Boy Scout jamboree. I used to be a Boy Scout counselor in San Francisco

when my boy was a member of the Boy Scouts. The Boy Scouts of Hawaii are very active, they are very American, and very similar to my own boy when he was that age.

The people of Hawaii worship the same God and attend the same churches as other Americans. They do not worship ancient Polynesian gods, nor do they assemble on the slopes of Hawaii's volcanoes to appease the fire goddess. The fire goddess of the volcano, the great Pele, exists in Hawaii much as the gods Thor and Wotan exist to the Scandinavian, or as Zeus or Jupiter exist in modern Greece—as legends of antiquity. The Hawaiian of today, just as you or I, is a Catholic, a Jew, or a Protestant.

Business in Hawaii today is a far cry from the South Seas trader variety. Hawaii's business houses are among the greatest in the world. In 1949, the gross income of corporations and individuals was in excess of a billion dollars. In that year, Hawaiians sent internal revenue collections of \$84,000,000, more than was collected in 10 States, to the Federal Treasury in Washington; since 1900, Hawaii has sent more than a billion dollars to the Federal Treasury.

The Government of Hawaii is largely like that of New York, or Pennsylvania, or other States. Hawaii has a bicameral legislature elected by the people in the same manner as legislatures are elected elsewhere in the United States of America. Her court system is exactly like the court system in the United States. The law these courts interpret and apply is Anglo-American law flowing back through the Magna Carta into the antiquity of the British common law.

The Governor of Hawaii, unlike the governors of the States, is not elected by the people. He is appointed by the President. His responsibility flows to the President, not to the electorate of the community which he governs. Neither do the people of Hawaii share in their Government in Washington. Hawaii is just a bystander in Washington. She has neither Congressmen nor Senators, only a non-voting Delegate to Congress.

Hawaii has long had constitutional government in the Anglo-American tradition. In fact, Hawaii has had a written constitution since 1840. That was before the State of California got its first constitution. It was before 15 of the present States had been organized as Territories under organic legislation.

In 1854, while Hawaii was still a constitutional monarchy, a treaty was proposed to bring Hawaii into the American Union as a State. Thirty-nine years later, in 1893, the Kingdom of Hawaii requested, as had the Republic of Texas, that the islands be annexed to the Union as a State. A year later, in 1894, after the overthrow of the monarchy, the Republic of Hawaii again asked for admission into the Union as a State. Finally, on July 7, 1898, by joint resolution of the Congress, Hawaii was annexed and made an integral part of the United States—a Territory. Then, in 1900, Congress enacted organic legislation for Hawaii and incorporated Hawaii into the Union.

On April 4, 1950, 110 years after Hawaii got her first written constitution as a gift from her king, a constitutional convention assembled in Honolulu to write what the people of the Territory of Hawaii hope will be their fifth constitution. It will be only a proposed State con-

stitution. It can be nothing more until the Congress of the United States takes action.

We were in Hawaii while the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention was in session. I was the minority's ranking member of the House Un-American Activities Committee during our investigation in Hawaii of subversive influences in the Territory. It is my judgment that the result of our investigation will help Hawaii's statehood chances. I feel that Hawaii can meet its problems more easily as a State.

In that connection, I would like to say that we learned that there were approximately 130 to 150 actual Communists in Honolulu, that is the FBI records there show, and from my personal knowledge I have learned, that in the last 2 years the real active members have varied between 130 and 150.

Now I noticed that Mr. Walter suggested that there were about 90 there at the present time. He may be right, I am not disputing his word, but according to the records, as I say, of the FBI, they carry an active list of Communists in the islands, in their field office there, and it appears that there are possibly at the present time 130.

Now, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover said that there were approximately 70,000 to 80,000 Communists in the United States. Taking the ratio as between the islands and the United States, it would appear then that there were about $2\frac{1}{2}$ Communists in Hawaii for every 10,000 people, based on the estimate of about 530,000 population in the islands.

In the United States there would be about 5 for every 10,000 people, based on the estimate of about 140,000,000 population in the United States, so it can easily be seen, as far as numbers are concerned, that the problem of communism in Hawaii is not as great as it is in the United States of America.

It is true, of course, that the Communists have concentrated in the ILWU, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union in the islands. In fact, I think we have some testimony which showed that about 90 percent of the Communists in Hawaii were infiltrated into the ILWU, and of course, there is some danger that the ILWU could tie up the shipping and all the industries of the islands again, but that danger does not come from the Territory of Hawaii.

It emanates directly from the United States. It emanates from California, particularly from Harry Bridges. I am confident that when we are able to get rid of Harry Bridges and his gang as an influence in California, that we will also be able to get rid of their influence in the Territory of Hawaii.

There is now before your Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a bill to enable Hawaii to become a State. That bill, H. R. 49, was favorably reported to the House by the Committee on Public Lands, and overwhelmingly supported by the House vote of 262 to 110. I am pleased to say that I voted in favor of statehood for Hawaii.

The people of my State hope for action on statehood for Hawaii in the Eighty-first Congress. The Illinois delegation in the House voted 21 to 3 for statehood for Hawaii. We want to see the statehood bill, H. R. 49, come to a vote in the Senate during this Congress. We want Hawaii admitted to statehood—now.

Senator BUTLER. Mr. Velde, your statement was quite interesting, but you did not dwell quite as much on the work that your investigat-

ing committee did, as I had hoped you would. Neither did Mr. Walter, and I have asked a few questions already with reference to the situation that Delegate Farrington says they are going to elaborate on a little more before these hearings are concluded.

I wonder if you have heard of the action taken by the ILWU, the west coast union which Bridges controls, and by the unions of Alaska, that has happened since your committee was out there.

Mr. VELDE. No, sir, I am sorry, I just returned from my home State.

Senator BUTLER. A number were fired by the national CIO because of their communistic leanings. I do not think they have fired the ILWU yet, but he is expecting it and he is setting himself up another powerful combination between Alaska, the west coast, and Hawaii.

Mr. VELDE. Bridges?

Senator BUTLER. Bridges; and your committee does not know anything about that as yet?

Mr. VELDE. No, I do not personally know anything about it. I do not know if the committee knows anything about it. I know that there was a convention of the CIO, the central committee of the CIO, as I understand it.

Senator BUTLER. This just happened less than a week ago.

Then too I wondered if you would have anything to say or care to make any remarks about the convention, the Territorial convention, held in Hawaii last Sunday where the real Democrats walked out of the convention.

Mr. VELDE. Sorry, I have not heard of that either.

Senator BUTLER. Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, in order to make this very definitely a part of the record, and to give the good people who are here from Hawaii an opportunity to answer a query that is in my mind that I think may be in the minds of some of the other members of the committee, although I have not talked to a single one of them, I would like to put in the record at this time a very short statement covering this matter, and then I think you will all know very definitely why I am hoping that you can elaborate upon this phase of the subject before it is finished.

Before the committee concludes its hearings, I believe it will want to consider thoroughly the events of the recent Democratic Territorial convention and the bearing that those events may have on the extent of Communist infiltration in the Territory.

To date, I know very little about what transpired except what I have been able to get from news clippings that have been sent to me from Hawaii. It appears, however, that in the Democratic Territorial convention held last Sunday some 15 of those who refused to testify before the House Un-American Activities Committee were delegates. When a motion was made to expel these persons from the convention a very large majority of the convention refused to take that action.

Mr. VELDE. Excuse me, Senator, may I interrupt you. You say this was a convention of the Democratic Party?

Senator BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. I understood it was the constitutional convention that you were referring to.

Senator BUTLER. No. I think I am correct, am I not, Mr. Farrington?

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is the biennial convention of the Democratic Party as I understand it.

Senator BUTLER. The territorial convention, that is my understanding. Anyway, there were quite a number of people in the convention who wanted to expell some 15 of those delegates. They were refused and thereupon a minority of the delegates (apparently, approximately one-third) walked out of the original convention, formed a new convention at another hall, and made a claim that they were the "true" Democratic Party of Hawaii.

I want to make it very plain that my sympathies are with this group that walked out. The point is, however, that they were definitely a minority. It appears that a considerable majority of the delegates to the Democratic Convention were at least very tolerant of communism within their midst. They not only permitted these 15 "unwilling" witnesses who appeared before your committee and refused to answer questions to remain as delegates in good standing, but they actually elected 4 of them to the 30-man Territorial Democratic Central Committee, according to the news reports that I have.

It is interesting to note that included in the group which remained were 5 members of the Territorial Legislature, 5 delegates to the constitutional convention, a Federal judge, and several other high officials. I want to emphasize that all of these so-called "unwilling" witnesses are persons who have been definitely named as Communists or former Communists in other testimony under oath before the House Un-American Activities Committee. Apparently some of those in the Territorial Democratic Convention felt they should not penalize the "contempt" crowd until their guilt was proved. Such an attitude may be explained, but it hardly explains why it was necessary to elect 4 of them to the party's central committee. It does not explain why no action has been taken by this majority group to ascertain the exact viewpoint and loyalty of these "unwilling" witnesses.

Altogether, I have seen no evidence that this majority group has any intention of cleaning house. I am, therefore, forced to the conclusion that the Democratic Party in Hawaii, as it is officially recognized in Hawaii, is substantially controlled by the Communist-led ILWU crowd and its fellow-travelers. If this ILWU-controlled party—one of the two major political parties in the Territory—should be successful at the polls in the event of statehood in the next election or any succeeding election, it appears that for the first time the government (including governorship, legislature, courts, and police) of one of the States might pass under control of a Communist-led group. Under territorial status, of course that could not happen. Jack Hall, the ILWU leader, is represented to have said recently: "We yearn for statehood. We passionately long for the right to elect our own Governor. We ardently desire the right to elect our judges." I am afraid he meant every word of that statement.

I want to make this statement now, so that witnesses for statehood may have the opportunity to make any comment they care to on it. I want to be fair about this. This statement is based largely on news reports, and I personally would be very glad to have the witnesses from Hawaii present the facts fully or correct any errors that may have appeared in the news accounts.

If, however, one of the two major parties of the Territory has passed under the control of the Communist-led faction, I believe that is a fact that this committee will want to consider very, very carefully before reporting this bill.

Senator ANDERSON. Do you have any comments on that, Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. Yes, Senator; I would like to make a general comment. Specifically as I said before, I am not particularly acquainted with the news that you have reported and the information that you have given, but I want to say too that our committee acted on a non-partisan basis in investigating communism in Hawaii.

Senator ANDERSON. There is nothing partisan in Senator Butler bringing this up. I am just as much interested in it as he is.

Mr. VELDE. Yes; I know you are, and so is Mr. Walter, and I want to pay a compliment to Mr. Walter at this time.

In the hearings out there while he was acting as chairman, he did not hesitate at all about bringing the infiltration of the Communists into the Democratic Party out into the open. I think that is probably a problem for the Democratic Party in Hawaii. It is no different particularly than it is in the United States.

I think that the Communists have attempted to infiltrate into the ranks of the Democratic Party in the States as well, probably with not as much success as they have had there.

Senator BUTLER. To make this perfectly a nonpartisan affair, I want to say that they have attempted the same thing in my own party, in the Republican Party.

Mr. VELDE. Yes; I think that is true, I agree with you, but I do not see where this makes the problem of communism any more serious in Hawaii than it is anywhere else, and I feel that as a State Hawaii would be better able to fight communism than they would as a Territory, and I believe that the Democratic Party, I mean the real good Democrats in Hawaii, would be better able to fight communism as a State than as a Territory.

The reason is that when they are able to obtain statehood, they will become a lot more loyal, not that they are not loyal at the present time in Hawaii. I think that they probably are a lot more loyal than many of us here in the States. I believe that that is definitely a problem for the two political parties to rid their ranks of the influence of communism.

Senator ANDERSON. Does it not have some bearing on the statehood question?

Mr. VELDE. I do not see particularly why it would.

Senator ANDERSON. The Republicans anticipate there will never be a Democratic victory in Hawaii, and we Democrats hope there will never be anything else.

If the Democratic Party is controlled by Communists, for what are we voting? We are voting to bring two people into the United States Senate who may have direct allegiance to the Communist Party. Does that not mean anything?

Mr. VELDE. I would regret that as much as anyone else.

Senator ANDERSON. The House would get two Members also, would it not?

Mr. VELDE. But I cannot agree with the statement of the Senator that the control of the Democratic Party in Hawaii is as great as his

statement would have us believe. I am satisfied that when your Democratic National Committee gets busy in Hawaii, it will not have too much trouble in eradicating it.

Senator BUTLER. Congressman, my sympathies are 100 percent with the people who walked out of the Democratic convention the other day, because they felt that it was dominated by the Bridges group, and one thing that they did was to fire a lady who had been a very loyal patriotic citizen, as Democratic national committeewoman.

Now I do not know who they elected, but evidently they did not like Victoria Holt and her kind. They wanted somebody else. I do not know who they elected, but it was somebody who was sympathetic with their views and stayed in the meeting.

Mr. VELDE. I appreciate that information. As I say, this is the first I have heard of it. I have been very busy at home, and I have not had an opportunity to read the papers.

Senator ANDERSON. You were in Hawaii with the Un-American Activities Committee?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Senator ANDERSON. Did you have people before you who refused to testify as to whether they were or were not Communists?

Mr. VELDE. Oh, yes; definitely.

Senator ANDERSON. How many?

Mr. VELDE. I believe there were 39. We have not assembled our report at this time, but I believe that the newspapers—and I think they probably quoted it correctly—

Senator ANDERSON. When will the report be assembled, because a lot of people may have some interest in that report before they vote on statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Walter could tell you better than I could, but I believe he intends to have it out in 2 or 3 weeks.

Senator BUTLER. I called him the other day, Mr. Chairman, and he told me at the time that he hoped to have it out in about a week, and I told him just unofficially that I hoped he would rush it as fast as he could because I thought it would be a factor in the hearings we are conducting now.

Senator ANDERSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, may I make a brief statement at this point?

Senator ANDERSON. I think it would be valuable. I do not want to be discourteous, but I do say that if we would have testimony on that point instead of the somewhat repetitious history we keep getting—we know that there are problems in connection with the organization of the Territories and we know that those Territories when they were organized were not perfect.

Now what about Hawaii? Don't bother about Idaho and New Mexico and California and the circumstances under which they were brought in. Is Hawaii ready for statehood? If we could have direct testimony on that, it would be helpful.

Mr. FARRINGTON. May I make a brief statement at this point? I want to say in reply to the point raised by Senator Butler that the members of this delegation who are Democrats particularly have given a great deal of thought to this request for information concerning what took place at the convention on Sunday, and the Secretary of the Interior as well has made a very thorough personal inquiry, and

we are all agreed that the Secretary should make a statement concerning those developments. He will be here sometime before noon for that purpose. I hope that he will have a copy of Senator Butler's statement prior to that time.

Now we are very much aware of this particular issue, and we are presenting a parade of our people to show you that we are people capable of contending with this problem, and every other problem that comes into Hawaii, and while you may feel that some of this does not relate to the issue of statehood, I want to say that from my standpoint it goes right to the heart of the question.

I think that after you have examined the record of the last election, the record of the election of delegates to the constitutional convention, which took place this year, and which you have been fully informed about by Mr. King and others, after you have heard some of the members of this party who are Democrats, you will be entirely satisfied on that point, but I wish to assure you that we are taking account of it.

Senator ANDERSON. Were four Communists elected to the constitutional convention?

Mr. FARRINGTON. No. One man who admitted he was a Communist was elected to the constitutional convention.

Senator ANDERSON. Were four people who refused to answer elected?

Mr. FARRINGTON. No; and the second man who was elected who refused to testify on the stand, was one of the ILWU leaders from the island of Kauai, and he was displaced.

The first man, a fellow named Richard Kageyama, was a member of the board of supervisors, and he stood for election to the constitutional convention when the investigating authorities knew he was a Communist, and if the people of that district had known he had ever been a member of the Communist Party, he would not have gotten to first base. There is no question about that. We can go through the records of the 61 other delegates.

Now this committee that Mr. Velde represents did an exceptionally fine job by exposing this problem, and I do not think there is the slightest doubt but that it will be dealt with, and dealt with adequately by our own people; and the fact that it exists is not any assurance that it is going to be any better under the Territorial form of government than it is under the State form of government.

Senator BUTLER. I would just like to add one word, Mr. Farrington, if I may. I want it distinctly understood that there is nothing partisan in reference to the point that I have brought up. Some of your witnesses have told with a great deal of pride that they are members of the Democratic Party. Others have said that they were members of the Republican Party.

In my own family it was mixed up a little bit. My father was a Democrat and I happen to be a Republican, and I am just as interested in having a sound, stable Democratic Party organization in Hawaii as I am in having a good sound Republican organization.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would like to call as the next witness a very prominent Democrat who was elected to the constitutional convention. He is the former attorney general of the Territory, Mr. J. Garner Anthony.

STATEMENT OF J. GARNER ANTHONY, MEMBER OF THE HAWAII STATE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have a written statement which I would like to leave with the committee, but rather than bothering the committee with reading it, I think the committee probably would be more interested in what took place at the constitutional convention.

Senator ANDERSON. Without objection, the statement will be incorporated in full in the record at this point.

(The statement above referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF J. GARNER ANTHONY

My name is Joseph Garner Anthony; born December 19, 1899, in Philadelphia, Pa., of English and Scotch-Irish ancestry. Public schools of Philadelphia; veteran, World War I; Swarthmore College, A. B. (1923); Harvard Law School, LL. B. (1926); resident of Hawaii since 1926.

Lawyer, member bar of Hawaii and Supreme Court of the United States, president, Bar Association of Hawaii 1937-39. State delegate to American Bar Association since 1944. President, Queen's Hospital. Attorney general of Hawaii 1942-43. Elected delegate at large to State constitutional convention.

I favor the pending legislation which will admit Hawaii to the Union as a State because:

(1) Hawaii has demonstrated its capacity for statehood by every standard that may be applied: population, ability for self-government, wealth, and the unquestioned loyalty of its people to the ideals of our American democracy.

(2) The admission of Hawaii into the Union as a State will bring to the councils of the National Government a fresh and informed point of view concerning the Pacific. The foreign affairs of this Nation will center largely about the Pacific, and the admission of Hawaii to the Union will be clear proof of the good faith of the United States with respect to people subject to its jurisdiction and will greatly enhance the prestige of the Nation in world affairs.

(3) Upon the problem of the treatment of racial and religious minority groups, Hawaii has much to contribute to the Nation. This is a difficult national problem and while Hawaii does not assert perfection in its solution, there exists in this community an attitude of mind and heart with regard to race and religion which has resulted in the races of men living together with a large degree of harmony and mutual respect, a situation which is perhaps not duplicated in any other State of the Union.

(4) Although a substantial degree of self-government is afforded under the organic act, we are not and never will be secure in our political, economic, and civil liberties until such time as we are admitted to the sisterhood of States. Our recent experiences of military government afford a good example. The people of no State of the Union would have been subjected to the excesses of military rule for over 3 years as were the people of Hawaii. The remedy in the Congress would have been swift and sure. Statehood will give us voting representation in the Congress, the right to vote for President, and the privilege of electing officials of State government of our own choosing; in other words "government by the consent of the governed."

(5) The Republic of Hawaii was incorporated into the United States with the implied understanding of ultimate statehood. To withhold the full rights of American citizenship from us now after a complete demonstration of our capacity of self-government and loyalty to the Nation would be a breach of the implied agreement; a breach of good faith on the part of the Nation. It would hurt the prestige of the United States in world affairs.

(6) The overwhelming majority of our people favor immediate statehood. A tiny minority equivocate by saying that they are in favor of it at a later date. A few craven souls no doubt will try to influence the Senate by furtive off-the-record objections. There is no validity to any argument for postponement. It is evidence of a disbelief in democracy. Those who suggest delay are secret opponents of statehood who lack the courage to articulate their opposition. The reason for the covert and devious ways of this minority is that any argument against statehood must be bottomed either upon disbelief in democracy, self-interests, or ignorance of American history.

The underground opponents of statehood advance the issue of communism. The radical element that exists in the labor movement in Hawaii is no different than the radical element that exists on the mainland. This movement is a national, not a local one. The people of Hawaii by their own State government will be better able to deal with such problems that arise than they would by being governed by remote control from Washington.

(7) Finally, the admission of Hawaii into the Union follows the historic pattern of our Government from its inception. Incorporated territories beginning with the Northwest Territory have all been admitted into the Union. There is no room in our scheme of government for holding Hawaii as an incorporated Territory in the continued status of a colonial province. Our form of government and American notions of fair play do not embrace the polity of the Roman Empire and its government of prostrate provinces. Evolution from a territorial status to statehood is in harmony with our history and the fundamental rights of man which are embodied in the organic documents of this Nation—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. I favor statehood because I believe we are entitled to it as matter of right.

Mr. ANTHONY. I am a practicing attorney, resident of Hawaii for the past 23 years, former attorney general, and was elected to the State constitutional convention.

The question of the qualifications of one person arose at the outset, and that was one of the delegates by the name of Richard Kageyama. It appeared that Kageyama had been secretly a member of the Communist Party, and he had withdrawn his membership. It appeared that as early as November 1949, he had made a full disclosure of his past membership in the Communist Party to the Federal authorities, and that according to a statement by him, when he filed his papers to run for the constitutional convention, that was with the full knowledge and approval of the investigating authorities.

Of course, the people of Hawaii did not know it. Now, as a matter of fact, he signed what we call down there the loyalty oath, which says that you have not been a member of the Communist Party for the past 5 years.

Senator ANDERSON. Had he been a member of the party during that time?

Mr. ANTHONY. He had. Now, that oath was not prescribed by law, but we adopted a resolution in the convention that all delegates would sign it even though it was not prescribed by law.

Senator ANDERSON. When they discovered that he had signed it and he had been a member, what did they do about him? Did he stay in?

Mr. ANTHONY. No. We immediately, the president here, Mr. King, had a conference with some of the lawyers in the convention, and we advised Mr. Kageyama's counsel that in our judgment the convention would oust him even though he had retired from the Communist Party, and we suggested that he resign.

That information was communicated to Kegeyama through his counsel, and the following day Mr. Kageyama tendered his resignation, and his place was filled. Incidentally, it was filled by a young man from the University of Hawaii.

As to the other case which arose, I was the vice chairman of the committee that examined into his qualifications. There has been no evidence that Mr. Frank Silva was a Communist. He did refuse to testify before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House.

Senator ANDERSON. What ground did he give for refusing?

Mr. ANTHONY. On the ground that it would tend to incriminate him, and I want to explain to the committee right here that that is not the same proposition of law that was passed on in the Lawson case. In that case the recalcitrant witnesses simply refused to testify. They said that the right to remain silent was included within the first amendment.

In this case, based upon the conviction in the New York courts of the 11 Communists, the argument that membership alone built them into a national conspiracy—these witnesses took the position that they should refuse to testify upon the ground that it would tend to incriminate them, a different question upon which the courts have not passed.

There may be some doubt as to whether or not the courts will sustain the right of those witnesses not to testify in these circumstances. I am inclined to think the courts will not, but it is still a serious legal question.

The point I want to make is that there was no evidence that Mr. Silva was a member of the Communist Party. No evidence was produced before our committee. There was a charge made in the course of that hearing before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Our committee of the constitutional convention took this position; that we were not going to pass on his guilt or innocence as a member of the Communist Party, but his simple refusal to testify constituted sufficient ground in our judgment to remove him from the constitutional convention, and that was the sole basis that we removed him on.

We gave him notice and opportunity to be heard. He was represented by counsel, and at the conclusion the vote was taken and I think with the exception of two or three dissenting votes—I think it was seven—he was ousted from the convention and his placed was filled.

Now I have never been very active in politics, and I do not have any up-to-date information on what took place last Sunday.

Senator ANDERSON. Did you not say you were attorney general?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes, sir.

Senator ANDERSON. How did you get to be that without being active in politics?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is an appointive office. It is not an elective office.

Senator ANDERSON. All right.

Mr. ANTHONY. The reason I was appointed attorney general was that I was appointed in an endeavor to restore the government of Hawaii to the people after the military had moved in and taken it over, and for that reason Governor Stainback appointed me as his attorney general, and we were finally successful in getting our government back away from the Army. It was not a political matter; but I want to get back to these so-called real Democrats and so-called Communist Democrats.

Now I do not know what the facts are, but it is just incredible to me to say that those people who stayed in that convention are Communists. There is no evidence of that.

Senator ANDERSON. I do not think that is what Senator Butler said.

Mr. ANTHONY. He said they are Communist-led.

Senator ANDERSON. I do not believe that is quite what he said. I think his statement pretty well speaks for itself. He points out that there were members in there who had refused to answer the question as to whether they were or were not Communists, and that those were the ones who were supported by the group, and that a third of the group left because they did not want to stay in the convention with the people who would not say whether they were or were not Communists. He pointed out that Mrs. Holt was deposed because of her attitude toward Communists in general.

Now, if the people high in the Democratic Party who are opposed to communism are going to be removed and people who are willing to tolerate communism are going to be put in in their place, then you can draw a fairly easy and quick line as to which way the Democratic Party is going, can you not?

I am hopeful, I am frank to say, that these two distinguished people who are before us here, with whom we have, many of us served, would state whether or not they are going to be able to keep their two parties respectively clean. I am glad to have your testimony also, and I am sure the others are.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think there is one good answer to that question. In the first place, we had an election in 1948, and in that election those who supported the PAC/in the prior election, the Political Action Committee of the CIO, were more or less turned out, and the election went against those same people that were elected in 1946 in the legislature.

We had another election, and the most significant one of all is the election to the State constitutional convention, and you can go down the list. Mr. King will give you the figures. I do not have them, but you can go right down the list. The leading ILWU candidates were defeated. Now, there is a vote of the people.

I do not know what the rules of the Democratic Party are, how these people happen to get in office. Maybe they will not be in office when there is another precinct meeting.

Senator ANDERSON. They will be in for 2 years.

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not know a thing about that, but the important thing is the vote of the people of Hawaii; and the vote of the people of Hawaii repudiated Bouslog, who is one of the lawyers for the ILWU and the leaders of the movement. That is one of the most significant things, and it is the expression of the people of Hawaii.

Now, I have no fear that we, if admitted as a State to the Union, will not be able to handle this problem. I think the people of Hawaii, judged by every standard, are ready for statehood, and this remark that was made the other day that we should follow the pattern of the English colonial policy; I was amazed to hear any such suggestion that we were the heir of the English colonial policy.

There is no room in the American scheme of things for any such status as perpetual colonial status. We are entitled to statehood, once we have the qualifications.

Now we have the qualifications based upon any study which you may submit, and the question is whether or not this Nation, the Congress of the United States, is going to keep faith with the people of Hawaii, and I say that the issue of communism is not an issue which affords any obstacle in any respect to our admission to the Union.

I was asked to say something about the judicial system. I would be glad to answer any questions if any member of the committee has any, but this hearing has already been prolonged, and I do not want to consume your time.

Senator ANDERSON. I am sure you recognize, Mr. Anthony, that many members of the committee, and probably most Members of the Congress, are convinced that Hawaii has the requirements for statehood with the exception of that one question that has been raised. That is why I was extremely anxious that you try to clear it up as to whether or not you are going to be able to keep from having a Communist-dominated State. There are none now in the Union.

Mr. ANTHONY. There is no question about that, Mr. Chairman. There is no question about that.

Senator MALONE. Mr. Anthony, you aroused my curiosity when you said that you are under a colonial system. Just what do you mean by that?

Mr. ANTHONY. We have government by remote control. We do not elect our Governor, we do not elect our judges. We do not select our Governor, we do not select our judges.

In other words, we have a government from Washington. Washington tells us who our judges are going to be. Washington tells us what salaries they are going to get.

Now right at that point it is, as the Senator probably knows, of the utmost importance to secure a satisfactory judiciary of high caliber so that you have two things: You have long tenure and adequate salaries.

The tenure of judges in Hawaii is the most tenuous of any of the judicial systems of the entire United States. Our judges could be removed tomorrow by the President, although they are appointed for a 4-year term.

We beat on the doors of Congress to raise the salaries of our judges and to extend the terms, and we have been unsuccessful. That is what I meant by government by remote control.

Senator MALONE. Well, you may have a couple of subjects mixed there. I think we have made arrangements whereby the Puerto Ricans elect their Governor, elect their judges or appoint their own judges.

Senator ANDERSON. Not the Federal judges, of course, but State judges.

Senator MALONE. Now take a colonial system such as England where they make money out of their colonial system, where they tax them for the benefit of the mother country. I do not believe that you would say that the United States makes any money on Hawaii.

Mr. ANTHONY. I did not mean that we were like a prostrate Roman province; I did not mean that for one moment; but we do not have what we are entitled to have as American citizens.

We cannot vote for the President of the United States; we have no representation in the Halls of Congress; and our economic, political, and civil liberties are never secure as long as we have a Territorial status.

Senator MALONE. Would you say that, whenever the economic situation justifies it, Puerto Rico should be a State?

Mr. ANTHONY. I would say "No," not until Puerto Rico is first incorporated as a Territory, which it is not.

Senator MALONE. Assuming they incorporate, which is a very short job, and they economically can qualify, should they become a State?

Mr. ANTHONY. If Congress has made the legislative judgment that Puerto Rico has reached the maturity to be entitled to the status of incorporation into the Union, and if thereafter they meet the other qualifications that have heretofore been applied as standards for admission to the Union, my answer would be "Yes."

Senator MALONE. What are those qualifications that have heretofore been applied?

Mr. ANTHONY. Qualifications are population, wealth, capacity to govern; and by those standards Hawaii—

Senator MALONE. Are those all the qualifications?

Mr. ANTHONY. Well, I did not intend that statement to be exhaustive. That is it in general. Loyalty to this Nation—they have to be American citizens naturally—ability to be a self-governing community. I would say those are in the main the qualifications.

Senator MALONE. Can you think of any other unit of the Government that happens to be under the supervision of the United States that now or in the future should become a State if they should incorporate and meet the population and economic requirements? In other words, is there an implied promise that a Territory should become a State, if we have the Territory, whenever it becomes incorporated?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is right; and that is why it is of the greatest importance when the Congress makes that initial judgment of incorporation.

Now there are only two incorporated Territories, only two Territories at the present moment, that have any prospect of enjoying the status of statehood, namely, Alaska and Hawaii.

Senator MALONE. Now you are aware, I suppose, that Guam will be incorporated and have its own set-up if we go through with the bill—

Mr. ANTHONY. It will not be an incorporated Territory, sir. You will have an organic act, and that will put it somewhat in the same situation as the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, as I understand the legislation.

Senator MALONE. Yes; and then the next step would be a regular incorporation if they have the population and wealth.

Mr. ANTHONY. No; I do not think so at all.

Senator MALONE. Why? Why should we hold them in any other status if there is implied promise whenever we throw the blanket over them?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; I did not say that. I said upon incorporation into the Union.

Senator MALONE. Could you give us a good reason why we should not allow Puerto Rico to become incorporated, it being closer to the mainland than Hawaii?

Mr. ANTHONY. For the same reason that you would not incorporate the Canal Zone into the Union.

Senator MALONE. Why is that? What is that reason?

Mr. ANTHONY. Well, those people down there are primarily foreigners, as I understand it. I am not sure about that.

Senator MALONE. Well, now, let us get into this foreigner business. How many people of the Caucasian race are in Hawaii?

Mr. ANTHONY. Roughly one-third of the population, but that does not say that the rest of them are not citizens.

Senator MALONE. Of course.

Mr. ANTHONY. These people in the back of the room may have brown skins, but they are Americans like you and I are.

Senator MALONE. That is right, but you brought it up. I did not bring it up.

Mr. ANTHONY. Maybe I am off the field.

Senator MALONE. Puerto Ricans are citizens, and a lot of them are good citizens. Many of them are coming into this country. Now, Hawaiians are good citizens; I am not saying anyone is not a good citizen; but you brought up the matter of foreigners. Now, how many foreigners do you have out there, and what are they?

Mr. ANTHONY. I did not get the last—

Senator MALONE. How many foreigners do you have there in Hawaii? Who are they? What are they? You referred to foreigners. I want to get this cleared up.

Mr. ANTHONY. I meant aliens; that is what I meant.

Senator MALONE. They are aliens until we incorporate them, but you said "foreigners," and I would like to pursue that a little further.

Mr. ANTHONY. What is that figure—69,000 aliens in Hawaii?

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is right.

Mr. ANTHONY. There is a chart up against the bookcase there.

Senator MALONE. Well, you read the chart. It is your chart. I do not understand it very well.

Mr. ANTHONY. Well, aliens of Caucasian ancestry, 2,725; aliens, Japanese, 30,486.

Senator MALONE. Those are Japanese that do not qualify for citizenship under any consideration; is that it?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is correct.

Senator MALONE. How many Japanese are there that do qualify?

Mr. ANTHONY. There are 149,216 Japanese citizens.

Senator MALONE. And how many aliens?

Mr. ANTHONY. Thirty thousand.

Senator MALONE. How many does that make altogether?

Mr. ANTHONY. One hundred seventy-nine thousand seven hundred and two.

Senator MALONE. What proportion of the population is that?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is roughly one-third of the total population.

Senator MALONE. One-third Caucasian and one-third Japanese?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is correct.

Senator MALONE. Now, how many Chinese?

Mr. ANTHONY. Thirteen thousand and fifty-one.

Senator MALONE. And how many native Hawaiians?

Mr. ANTHONY. There are 10,548 Hawaiians; and part Hawaiian is the largest group, 73,277.

Senator MALONE. I think you have explained your own question now about "foreigners."

Now, I have been to Hawaii on three different occasions. I was there during the war and had an interview with Admiral Nimitz and

your Governor at that time, and the man in charge of the war government.

Mr. ANTHONY. You mean the general in charge? The military government? That was Richardson—Robert C. Richardson, Jr.

Senator MALONE. Richardson was the one. Acting as a consultant for the Senate Military Affairs Committee. I was instructed to find out certain things about the government. You were having considerable inside trouble there; but I concluded that it was not very serious; it was more or less a struggle of two groups which promised to be ironed out, as you say it now has. But there never has yet been any Territory, admitted as a State to the Union, except contiguous Territories.

Now, at first glance it may not seem important to you, and it may not be important, but if we take in noncontiguous areas, which to my mind is a rather serious decision in the first instance, then after that there would be no reason why we should not take in any area that qualified as you described.

It would be taken in as a protectorate or whatever you might call it, and then later it could incorporate and still later become a State. Now your implication that you have fulfilled all the qualifications of any other State is not quite in line with—

Mr. ANTHONY. Well, other than contiguity, I will make that exception, sir.

Senator MALONE. That is right. Now then, would there be any other reason why the United States should not take in Puerto Rico if it followed the steps that you suggest Hawaii has followed? Or Guam? Or Okinawa? I was in Okinawa. Those are very smart people out there. I could not tell whether they were Japanese or Chinese or just what they were. I guess they were a little of both, but they looked like very intelligent people and upstanding fighters, and it looks like they would make good citizens.

Mr. ANTHONY. If I may answer you as to Puerto Rico, the Secretary of the Interior said here in this hearing at the outset that the people of Puerto Rico do not want statehood.

Senator MALONE. Well, of course you remember us. We went down to find out whether they should be citizens or not. They had an application in here the same as you have.

Now I do not know whether we made any decision on the Senate floor, but at least it was made very clear by the committee members who went down there that they did not believe Puerto Ricans were ready, so maybe that had something to do with their later decision.

Mr. ANTHONY. It probably did. They have a very different economic status than we do. I mean the standard of living I think you will agree is much different in Puerto Rico than it is in Hawaii.

Senator MALONE. Well, the standard of living of the real poor people, yes; but there is a lot of wealth in Puerto Rico, and it has great possibilities in different ways.

Now this is a little beside the question, but I was trying to get the picture in your mind that maybe you are a little too positive that you have all the qualifications and that you have been given an implied promise of something. You sort of put the Senate in a whole when you do that. Being 2,000 miles away from us is perhaps one of the reasons you do. You do not quite get the picture.

Senator ANDERSON. I think, Senator Malone, we have been over that a great deal. I was just going to say we have a brief on it, and most of us I think feel the question of whether there is a promise implied or otherwise is not very important in this thing.

(The following letter and statement were subsequently furnished by Delegate Farrington with the request that they be inserted in the record at the close of Mr. Anthony's testimony:)

APRIL 25, 1950.

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS,
*Chairman, House Committee on Un-American Activities,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR FRANCIS: Enclosed herewith are two copies of the statement I made before the Hawaiian constitutional convention when the case of Mr. Frank G. Silva was being considered in committee of the whole.

I thought you might include this statement in your committee's file on Mr. Silva and make such other use of it as seems appropriate.

Governor Stainback has appointed, in place of Mr. Silva after his expulsion by the convention, a Mr. Matsuki Arashiro, a representative in our legislature, a Democrat, and also an ILWU official. His reputation as a labor leader is excellent, and I understand there has never been any question but that he is free from any communistic affiliations.

Since the convention expelled Mr. Silva, there have been several editorials in both our daily papers commending the action of the convention. Some of those who voted against the resolution adopted by the convention did so on technical grounds rather than on the main issue. I doubt if there would have been more than two votes against the resolution if our legal experts had not raised some fine points against its precise phraseology.

I am sure I express the sentiments of the great majority of the people of Hawaii when I extend to you the thanks of this community for the fine job you and your committee did in clarifying the Communist issue in these islands.

With warmest personal regards and Aloha, I am

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL WILDER KING,
President, Hawaii State Constitutional Convention.

STATEMENT MADE BY PRESIDENT SAMUEL W. KING BEFORE THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF HAWAII OF 1950 IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE, ON THURSDAY, APRIL 20, 1950, DURING THE HEARING ON RESOLUTION No. 25, CALLING FOR THE EXPULSION OF DELEGATE FRANK G. SILVA, FOR CONTUMACIOUS CONDUCT BEFORE THE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF HAWAII OF 1950

Having been recognized by the Chair, Delegate King addressed the committee as follows:

The counsel for Delegate Silva has referred to me and my rude reply for an extension of time. The sergeant-at-arms told me shortly before 11 o'clock that Delegate Silva's counsel had requested the convening of the convention a half hour late. I had no desire to be rude—no desire to rush the proceedings—but simply sent word that a certain amount of business would come before the convention prior to the time, under special orders, when Silva's case under the pending resolution, would come up.

I would like to say further that the committee that was appointed to review this case consisted not only of lawyers, but of other persons of character and integrity and standing in this community. The chairman was Benjamin Wist, delegate from the fourth district; vice chairman, J. Garner Anthony, one of our prominent attorneys; another member was Miss Marguerite K. Ashford, an attorney who has served as attorney for the senate of the Territorial legislature. Another member was Mr. Alexander Castro; another member, Mr. Frank C. Luiz, an official of the ILWU, representing a local from the island of Hawaii; another member, Mr. Chuck Mau, a liberal and an attorney; another member, Mr. Frederick Ohrt, who has a large number of years back of him of splendid public service; another member, Mr. Tom T. Okino, an attorney and county attorney of the island of Hawaii for many years—a man of outstanding character and respectability in his own district; another member, Harold S. Roberts, a student of government, political philosophy—a university professor; another

member, Mr. Arthur K. Trask, another attorney, a Democrat and also a liberal; another member, A. D. Woolaway from Maui, a businessman respected in his community.

That committee of 11 didn't attempt to persecute or prosecute Mr. Silva. I sat in at two meetings of that committee—all of one afternoon when Mr. Symonds (attorney for Mr. Silva) was present; and also all of one evening when neither Mr. Symonds nor Delegate Silva was present. At that first meeting, Delegate Silva was assured that the committee was very friendly; that the committee desired to get at the root of the matter and find every occasion for treating Mr. Silva with consideration. At that time, Mr. Symonds made the statement that his advice to Mr. Silva to refuse to testify before the House Un-American Activities Committee was because he would be prosecuted for perjury and probably be found guilty in the state of hysteria in the world or in America today. I challenged that statement and Mr. Symonds immediately modified it and brought it down to a more moderate tone. By the first statement, I understood him to say that he didn't feel that Delegate Silva, if he had testified before the Un-American Activities Committee, would get justice in the courts of Hawaii or those of the United States.

Now, further, Mr. Silva had an opportunity on the point of personal privilege to submit to this house, when the original proposition as brought, a personal statement. He submitted his press release, made immediately after he was subpoenaed as a witness before the Un-American Activities Committee, and very evidently prepared beforehand; and a copy of that release was signed by him and is on file in this proceeding.

And that release says, in one paragraph (quoting from Delegate Silva's press release):

"As an elected official of the ILWU it seems clear to me that the Un-American Committee is in Hawaii at the request of elements who want to destroy our union. I am certainly not going to aid them in that purpose.

"The second purpose of the committee's investigations is to kill statehood, despite all their protestations to the contrary. As a native-born resident of this Territory, I am concerned about this attempt to block our political aspirations."

Now, in the afternoon meeting that I did not attend, Mr. Silva handed in a written statement, and if the convention will bear with me I will find it—the statement of Frank Silva, dated April 17 [reading from statement]:

"This subcommittee has asked me to consider three matters."

The subcommittee or special committee had asked him to consider whether, as a matter of protection of the reputation of this convention and of this Territory, and the efforts we are going through now to draft a constitution which will be accepted by the people of Hawaii and by the Congress of the United States, he might not resign, if he felt that he could not testify before the Un-American Activities Committee on certain grounds—constitutional grounds. He had involved this convention into his private difficulties and problems; and we asked him if he couldn't—wouldn't—consider resigning. And, if I remember correctly, that suggestion came, as a suggestion only and not as a recommendation, from Mr. Chuck Mau. And he was further asked would he not purge himself by going before the committee and saying, "I want to testify that I am not a Communist, have never been a Communist, and don't intend to be a Communist."

And in this letter of April 17, he declined to take any of those suggestions and he made in here statements that I consider have rendered him disqualified and unfit to sit in this body [quoting from letter]:

"The hearings were timed by Governor Stainback and Big Five interests to coincide with the convention hearings in order to defeat statehood."

That is subparagraph (a) of paragraph 2.

"b. The hearings are for the purpose of destroying the ILWU. No further proof of this statement is necessary than the revival of the Dear Joe letters in the Advertiser. Everything I have accomplished in my life I owe to the union. Through the ILWU I have acquired dignity as a human being, something I would never have acquired from any company on Kauai, all of whom blacklisted me because of union activity before and after my 3 years of combat duty as an infantryman."

Now we asked him in this committee meeting which I attended as an ex-officio member without a vote, if he didn't feel that his obligation to Hawaii, to this convention, and the United States wasn't higher than his obligation as an official of the ILWU? Apparently, he doesn't think so.

He has spoken about the people who elected him to office. He was elected with a narrow majority over his competitor in one zone district of Kauai. I told Frank in my office I had a great deal of consideration for him as a human being. I believed that he was wrongly advised and wrongly directed by his counsel and by those who were giving him advice. I told him then, I said, "Don't forget, Frank, that besides the people who voted for you, you are representing the people who didn't vote for you. You are representing the people who voted for your opponent. You are one of six representatives from the island of Kauai—you are representing all of the people on Kauai—and you are representing the people of Hawaii—the 550,000 or 540,000 people of Hawaii—and, indirectly, you are representing the people of the United States because we are aspiring to draft a constitution that will admit us into the Union as a sovereign State." And Frank didn't seem to consider that point.

Now as regards the statement this morning—maybe it was hurried—maybe some of the language in there was not intended. Nevertheless, it was a statement prepared for him by his counsel and submitted to this convention; and the language in that is, I say, most contumacious.

But that has not been included in this resolution; this resolution refers to the data before this convention prior to his statement, and the data before the special committee; and that special committee rendered a unanimous report.

There were some who desired a stronger report. There were some who might have desired a less strong report. Nevertheless, there was a meeting of minds and those 11 gentlemen—10 gentlemen and 1 lady—signed that report and submitted it to this convention as their considered judgment.

Now I fail to see where Delegate Silva has not received a square deal from this convention. We have leaned over backward, as I said a moment ago when I made a motion to table a previous motion—maybe my motion was not called for—maybe what we have heard here will help the convention to come to a good decision.

But, nevertheless, that resolution is very simple: "*Resolved*, That Frank G. Silva, by reason of his contumacious conduct before and toward the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives, etc."

Don't you believe this press release is contumacious conduct? And I don't listen to the radio very often—I have been too busy with the affairs of this convention—but, nevertheless, I have heard the same, and stronger statements have gone over the air during the past 2 days. Don't you believe that this other statement that he made on April 17 is contumacious conduct toward this convention and toward the Un-American Activities Committee of the United States Congress? And this resolution goes on further and says, "toward the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives and this constitutional convention of Hawaii of 1950."

I consider that the two statements made to this committee is contumacious conduct toward this convention. We almost begged him to come clean. There was another witness that was accused, wrongly or rightly, who went up there and took the oath and said, "I am not a Communist and have never been a Communist." Now if he has committed perjury, he can be tried for it, or not; but certainly it cannot be taken back to Congress with the request that he be cited for contempt of Congress. This young man has not done that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to take up too much time—I am speaking on a point of personal privilege, but I am also speaking on the adoption of this resolution. I certainly have not been rude to Mr. Symonds or to Mr. Silva. The convention has a fixed hour—it was fixed yesterday—I have no right to postpone that hour and we met at 11 o'clock. If he had not been ready I am sure that somebody on this floor would have moved for a recess. As a matter of fact, I told the sergeant-at-arms that possibly such might happen, but I didn't feel it was up to me to say "yes; we will hold the convention up a half hour while you complete your statement"; and don't forget that in the recommendations of this committee he was allowed something like 48 hours to prepare his brief to show cause why he didn't consider he had to purge himself of contempt.

I would like to move the previous question, Mr. Chairman, but I won't do so if there are others who would like to speak.

I hope that the convention will realize that my aggressiveness is through no animosity toward that young man. I think he is a most unfortunate young man who, in his devotion to labor, has allowed himself to become tainted by his associations. I want to say this: That in this United States of America today we have Communists infiltrating the labor movement to serve the purposes of the Communist Party. And we have loyal and well-meaning labor men being engulfed

by the Communist movement in their desire to further the cause of labor. I would like to see the labor leaders disassociate themselves from those who are tainted with communism, and stand fair and square as labor men only, with no affiliations or associations that are inimical to the safety of the United States. Thank you.

Senator ANDERSON. Secretary Chapman is going to be here at 11:30.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the next witness is the chairman of the Republican Party, but before he makes his statement, I would like to ask Mr. Kendall to present his statement, if he is still here. Mr. Kendall represents one of the largest organizations of employees in the Territory. The government employees of Hawaii are organized and very effectively, and he directs that organization. He is going to make a very brief statement and present a document.

STATEMENT OF C. H. KENDALL, SECRETARY, HAWAIIAN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' ASSOCIATION

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in order to introduce myself, I want to state that I was born in the State of Indiana, educated in the public schools there, attended the University of Butler at Indianapolis, graduated from the University of Dayton, at Dayton, Ohio, and did post graduate work at the University of California for 2 years.

I have been a resident of the Territory for a period of 21 years, having first gone to Hawaii as a full-time instructor and athletic director at St. Louis College.

I have been affiliated with the government now for a period of 14 years, and in my present capacity am executive director of the Hawaii Employees' Association and have been since 1946.

We are not affiliated nationally with any organization, and the organization has been organized for a period of 16 years. The Government Employees' Association sent me here to make a plea in their behalf for statehood for Hawaii, and I have endeavored, and I present to you, a short statement together with certain exhibits, which will have the effect of showing you the progress which has been made in our government in Hawaii during the past 20 years.

There is nothing further that I can add that other witnesses have not already told you, so with your leave I will present this short statement to you, together with these exhibits, which will give you an opportunity to compare the progress that we have made in government over a period of 20 years, and it is our feeling that we have the most progressive government as far as government employees are concerned that there is in the United States.

We do not say that we have the best in every phase of government, but at least as far as conditions of employment of the employees is concerned, we feel that we are superior to any State in the Union, so that these 8,000 government employees that I represent make this plea to you to give us statehood now.

Senator ANDERSON. Thank you.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Soares, who is the chairman of the Republican Party of Hawaii, will be next.

Senator ANDERSON. Mr. Kendall, how much of this needs to go into the record? I think we will only incorporate the statement in the record and the rest of it will be retained as an exhibit by the committee.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Kendall above referred to follows:)

As the executive director of the Hawaiian Government Employees' Association, representing the interests and the welfare of the civil servants of the Territorial government and its political subdivisions, I appeal to your honorable body for a favorable consideration of our request to acquire an equality of vested rights and a full representation by our citizens in the Government of the United States as a member of the sisterhood of sovereign States. Attached hereto and made a part of this record is a resolution, marked "Exhibit A," duly adopted by the general council of our association. This resolution, adopted August 20, 1949, states our position on the question of statehood for Hawaii.

The association which I represent was organized in the year 1934 and has as a membership approximately 8,000 of the employees of the Territorial and county governments of Hawaii. We are an independent organization with no national or international affiliations.

Attached hereto and marked "Exhibit B" is a copy of the constitution and bylaws of our association. The objects of that constitution clearly states the responsibility of our membership to work for a more efficient government service. We have endeavored to follow the pattern of our national leaders by having incorporated within the body of this constitution a no-strike provision. It is noteworthy to mention, in passing, that at no time since the inception of this organization have we broken faith with the people of Hawaii by repudiating this no-strike pledge. By the same token, we feel we should acknowledge the fact that the people of Hawaii, our lawmakers, and our administrators have not broken faith with us.

Our record in Hawaii during the past 15 years clearly shows that the men and women who were responsible for the enactment of our laws have been visionary and have demonstrated keen judgment. That record will show that they have honestly endeavored to apply the basic principle for good government, that of attracting to and holding in the Government service, men and women of ability.

In applying this theory for good government, a pattern for high salaries has been applied in order to attract to our Government offices men and women with high qualifications. A comparison of the salaries paid the employees of Hawaii with local and State jurisdictions in the continental United States will show there are very few which pay more.

In order to protect Hawaii from the rampages of a spoils system, civil service and classification laws were enacted during the years 1939 and 1941. Our classification system was patterned after the Closing Report Classification and Compensation Schedules of 1929. This so-called closing report was the result of a study instituted by the Congress of the United States in order to bring the salaries of Government workers and those in private enterprise into closer focus.

The record will show that the Congress of the United States never put the recommendation of this report into effect. However, our legislative fathers, not being satisfied with the provisions of the Brookhart schedules, not only adopted the closing report in principle, they went one step further by altering the basic salary schedules to the end that the employees in the lower classified positions were granted salaries which were higher than either the closing report or the Brookhart schedule.

With the increase in the cost of living since the start of World War II, these schedules have been materially increased. Attached hereto and marked "Exhibit C" is the compensation schedule which is in effect in Hawaii today. In addition to these basic rates of compensation, the employees are paid a \$25 a month bonus in order to take up some of the slack as a result of high prices and the added fact that salary studies have not been completed whereby basic rates may be altered on an equitable basis.

Our civil-service law, enacted in 1939, was patterned after that of the Federal Government, and a perusal of the same will disclose the fact that it compares very favorably with any others in existence in the United States. This law, together with the rules and regulations which have the force and effect of law, are attached hereto and marked "Exhibit D." After 10 years of experience with this law, the people of Hawaii, our civil service authorities, our legislators and the employees feel that the time is apropos for revisions in the same in order to keep abreast of sound administrative policies and procedures. Attached hereto and marked "Exhibit E" is a copy of the new law which is being considered by the hold-over committee of the 1949 legislature.

The 1947 legislature, being satisfied that they would not have the time to make a complete and thorough investigation of the classification and salary structure of our government, created by resolution a salary study commission whose duty and responsibility it was to ascertain whether there was any need for a change in our classification law and the basic rates of compensation which were in effect. The findings and recommendations of this commission were presented to the 1949 session of the legislature for their consideration. However, its late presentation precluded proper consideration by that body, with the result that the results of this survey, together with the recommendations, were referred to a legislative holdover committee for further study with recommendation to be made to the 1951 legislature.

A comparison of our Territorial retirement system with those in effect in any State in the Union will substantiate our contention that there is none better. Attached hereto for your scrutiny, marked "Exhibit F" is a copy of our retirement laws.

The sick leave and vacation privileges granted government employees in Hawaii are liberal to the utmost, the employees being granted 21 working days' vacation a year and the same number for sick leave, with accumulation privileges up to 54 days. Authority is given the Governor for Territorial employees, the mayor for the city and county of Honolulu, and the chairman of the respective county boards of supervisors, to grant sick leave in excess of 54 days where there is meritorious cause.

The 1949 legislature, in order to bring the hours of work into focus with the pattern which is being followed in the United States, enacted a 40-hour workweek law. After a few months' experience with this law, through the interpretations of the attorney general of the Territory, the special session of the legislature referred this particular law to a holdover committee for further study and recommendation. Attached hereto and marked "Exhibits G and H" is the law as it exists today and the proposed law being recommended by the legislative holdover committee.

It is our conviction that our police and fire departments throughout the Territory are of the finest, and that the training of these men, their equipment and facilities will compare very favorably with any city of the United States.

In order to assure to the people of Honolulu adequate water, the Territorial legislature saw fit to remove the board of water supply from the complete domination of politics, the result being that we have one of the finest water systems in America today.

We pride ourselves in the advancement we have made with our parks and recreational facilities and our public utilities, although privately owned, are operated in a very businesslike and efficient manner with ample service to the entire Territory.

We have a very progressive tax program in effect in Hawaii and history shows it has been changed from time to time to fit the needs of our community.

It is the firm belief and conviction of the members of our association that in the over-all picture, government in Hawaii is as progressive and forward as will be found in any jurisdiction in the United States. It is, therefore, our feeling that if the Congress of the United States were to grant us admission as the forty-ninth sister State, there will be incorporated into our State constitution sound provisions to assure the further continuance of this efficient and progressive government.

We, therefore, humbly submit that we have demonstrated our ability to legislate progressively and to efficiently administrate; and our acceptance of this progressive legislation and sound administration is definite proof that we are ready, willing, and able to be granted our inalienable right to sit as citizens in the Government of the United States as a member of the sisterhood of sovereign States.

Respectfully submitted.

C. H. KENDALL,

Executive Director, Hawaiian Government Employees' Association.

(Exhibits A, B, C, D, E, F, G, and H, submitted by Mr. Kendall, will be found in the files of the committee.)

STATEMENT OF OLIVER P. SOARES, CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY OF HAWAII

Mr. SOARES. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee:

My name is Oliver P. Soares. I was born a subject of the Kingdom of Hawaii during the reign of the merry monarch, Kalakaua.

My parents were originally from Springfield, Ill.

I am enough of a hero worshipper to take pride in the fact that my grandfather was a contemporary of Abraham Lincoln.

I have come here for the express purpose of testifying at this hearing. The cost is not being paid out of any legislative appropriation, nor is it being borne by the political party which it is my pride to be presently serving as its State chairman.

I am a member of the bar of the courts of the Territory of Hawaii and of the Supreme Court of the United States, where my batting average is 1,000. I should qualify this by saying I have been up only two times.

I am engaged in the general practice of law. This takes me to all the islands.

I have no corporations—Big Five or any size—among my clients.

I have served four terms as a member of the house of representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii.

Like Senator Rice, though of somewhat younger age, I was present at the raising of the American flag at the time of annexation.

Senator MALONE. At that point, what companies make up the so-called Big Five?

Mr. SOARES. My list is American Factors Ltd., Alexander & Baldwin Co., C. Brewer & Co., Castle & Cooke, and Theodore H. Davies & Co.

Senator MALONE. Could you give us the names of the managers or presidents?

Mr. SOARES. The manager of the American Factors is H. P. Faye.

Senator ANDERSON. I thought Mr. Walker was.

Mr. SOARES. He just resigned. Mr. Spaulding, I believe, is president of Brewer & Co.; Mr. Budge is president of Castle & Cooke; Mr. Bell is president of Alexander & Baldwin; and Mr. Russell, I believe, is president of Davies & Co.

Senator MALONE. I suppose the reason you were careful to say that you did not represent them is they are reputed to control much of the economy of the islands.

Mr. SOARES. No; that is not the reason. The reason is that the question has been raised in some minds that they do control.

I have had occasion to tell them in my capacity as chairman of the party, that they do not control political affairs, and it is likewise true that while they influence, they do not control economic affairs.

Referring to the raising of the American flag, there happened on that occasion a minor incident which I have since come to wonder whether it was prophetic of the delay we are now experiencing in obtaining that full measure of American citizenship which can come only with statehood. On hoisting the flag, the rope jammed at the top of the pole, and there was a delay while a boy from my neighborhood climbed the pole and released the rope.

Nearly 45 years afterward I stood under the same royal palm on the same spot where I had stood at the flag raising, and heard Presi-

dent Roosevelt say, in a speech delivered from the upper lanai of the palace, "Hawaii is an integral part of the United States." The thrill I had experienced as a boy when Old Glory replaced the Hawaiian flag, I experienced again for, to me at least, there was that in the inflection of the President's voice when he repeated those well-known words that held promise of quick statehood for Hawaii.

I want to bear witness that such is the alertness and intelligence of our electorate, that communism in Hawaii will always be kept at bay. And this is true whether we remain a Territory or come into our just heritage of statehood.

In the election of 1946, which took place before I became state chairman of my party, we lost control of the house of representatives and held control of the senate by but one vote. For the first time in the history of the Legislature of Hawaii, membership in the house was evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats.

Because certain people high in the ranks of the CIO who were also duly enrolled members of the Democrat Party, and some of whom, I doubt not, were Communists, took it upon themselves to direct the strategy of the Democrat members of the House, the feeling got abroad that the Communists were in control of the government. They did delay the organizing of the House some 18 or 19 days, but they did not influence a single piece of legislation which came out of that session. The following session showed that they had been completely routed insofar as the legislature was concerned. The Republicans gained a two-thirds majority in the House and missed a like majority in the Senate by only one vote.

We of Hawaii have been nurtured in the belief that it is with ballots that the battle for good government and the American way of life is to be fought in our land and we have fought, and will continue to fight, in that way.

By the very thorough work of the congressional committee investigating un-American activities in Hawaii, it has been clearly demonstrated that not a single Communist or Communist sympathizer, is now, or was ever in the ranks of the Republican Party in Hawaii. They shun us as they would a plague. Our party has become stronger and stronger as we have continued to wage war on communism. This fact is proof positive that Hawaii's people as citizens of a state will keep the Communists out of power just as we kicked them out when their presence became suspected.

May I add a word along another line? Sometime before I left home, I heard it suggested by some of the opponents of statehood, for Hawaii, that our coming before this committee was a wholly useless effort because the Congress would want to know what advantage would accrue to the United States if Hawaii be admitted. I cannot believe that this committee or the Senate will act from mercenary motives. I should like, however, to put in this record my answer to those people at home who ask, What will the United States gain?

In terms of dollars and cents, the United States will be relieved of the burden of what it is now spending for territorial government which it is not required to spend for state government. This includes the full cost of the executive department; the salaries of the entire judiciary, and the compensation of the members of the legislature.

Senator ANDERSON. We are not trying to analyze this on a financial basis, but if you are going to open it up, what do we get for the \$84,-

000,000 we formally got as Federal income tax? You are starting to balance back and forth. Are we going to start counting dollars on this thing?

Mr. SOARES. No. I am saying that it should not be a consideration. Senator ANDERSON. Then why are you going into it?

Mr. SOARES. Merely to answer the people who have made the point.

Senator ANDERSON. Where are they, in Hawaii?

Mr. SOARES. Yes, sir.

Senator ANDERSON. So you put it into this record?

Mr. SOARES. Quite so, because this record is being followed very, very closely in Hawaii.

But more important still is the fact that there will be added men and women who can, and who will, interpret to the entire Pacific area the true spirit of America in the manner in which only a person who himself has become a beneficiary of that spirit can interpret it.

The admission of Hawaii to the sisterhood of States will give to our Nation a vast reservoir of men and women born and raised in, and who practice, the belief expressed in the motto of Hawaii: The life of the land is preserved in righteousness.

Thank you very much for this opportunity of being heard.

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Senator ANDERSON. Certainly.

Senator MALONE. I think you have made a very good statement in showing the close control of the legislature by the two parties, which is a very good thing. It shows alertness on the part of the citizens. Did not Hawaii furnish as large or even a larger percentage in the last war in enlistments as the mainland did?

Mr. SOARES. Yes, indeed, and in every other part of the war effort.

Senator MALONE. And there were some Japanese units that were sent from Hawaii, almost altogether Japanese units, were there not?

Mr. SOARES. That is true.

Senator MALONE. They made a very good record, a fine record as a matter of fact.

Mr. SOARES. Yes, sir.

Senator MALONE. Would you give us the number, if you have it, of these units?

Mr. SOARES. No, I am sorry I cannot, but that was included in two previous statements made by other witnesses.

Senator MALONE. That is all right then. I did not happen to hear that.

Senator ANDERSON. We had two very fine statements from veterans who had been disabled and who had done splendid jobs.

Senator MALONE. I was told by Admiral Nimitz that they made as good soldiers as he had found any place.

Mr. SOARES. Sir, they could not help it. They were Americans through and through.

Senator MALONE. I happened to be the one that consulted the Senate Military Affairs Committee when they investigated Japanese camps during the war in this country. We found that 1,900 young Japanese boys of military age had said that they would not fight for the United States, in other words, that they would be loyal to Japan.

We also found that some of them did not understand. Some of them thought that if they did not go into the Army, something else would happen to them. When they understood a good many of them changed.

Mr. SOARES. May I interrupt to say that that number was almost exclusively from the mainland of the United States, and from States who have not embraced them as Hawaii has, on the basis of their full American citizenship.

Senator MALONE. I neglected to mention that. I think they were totally within the United States. I only mention this to show the contrast.

Now I agree with the chairman that as far as mercenary gain to the United States is concerned, I believe the record would show that all possessions of the United States, call them whatever you may, have always cost us money. We never have gained financially by any Territory.

That is the difference that I meant to show to Mr. Anthony, the former witness, between England and other empire-minded nations, and the United States.

We take over a Territory and it always costs us money. When they take over a Territory they tax them for the benefit of the homeland. That is the reason that I did not like the reference to colonial set-up here.

Mr. SOARES. I am very sorry I did not make it clear enough that I was not for 1 minute suggesting that that was not a consideration at this end of the country. I wanted to illustrate—and my excuse for having it in this record is to point out how specious is the argument used in Hawaii by the opponents of statehood.

Senator MALONE. Now, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the witness and the record, I want to state that many of us who have not been ready to vote for statehood, who have not been against it but are not ready to vote for it because we would favor more control in Hawaii, in Puerto Rico; would favor letting you take care of your own business to a large extent. Certainly if there is any one Member of the Senate that is against centralizing control, it would be the junior Senator from Nevada.

Senator ANDERSON. I think I would subscribe to that.

One question, Mr. Soares, just before you go. I was very much interested in your statement, and thought it was a fine one. You do not have any questions whatever on this Communist matter?

Mr. SOARES. No questions, sir. We have all the answers.

Senator ANDERSON. You have handled it all right as far as you are concerned?

Mr. SOARES. Yes, sir; very definitely.

Senator ANDERSON. And you think you will go right along handling it without any question?

Mr. SOARES. There is no indication that we should not, because the feeling, the knowledge, that the people are gaining—may I say that our party conducts a civic forum of the air every Friday night for the purpose of disseminating information, and we have been non-partisan on it, and we have not been afraid to let the opponents of our principles speak.

We had a forum on communism at which Estelle Stark, a prominent Communist who was there to testify for Reinecke in his case, was on the air. We were taken to task for having given her the opportunity, but those very people realized after our people heard directly from a prominent national figure in communism that much was done to protect us against the influence from that organization.

Senator ANDERSON. I am glad to have the professional testimony of somebody who takes an active part in politics. A great many people dodge this question of taking an active part in politics. I don't, and I am glad that you don't.

Now as a person who takes an active part in politics and in public life, getting down to the cases of what it takes to elect people to offices, you are not worried about the Communist situation?

Mr. SOARES. No, sir; I am not so long as we carry on as we do. We do not blink at the presence of Communists, but we do know that, when the attention of the people is called to the difference between them and our way of life, it is as we say "pau" for them; it is all over.

Senator MALONE. I am interester to hear you say that you do understand how things are done, and it is politics. The word "politics" has degenerated somewhat over the years, it seems to me.

Any attempt to govern any public relations comes under the heading "Politics," and any one who denies that he does not enter into politics to get what he wants is somewhat insulting the intelligence of people who understand how business is done, and it is not the politics of influence; that is not what I mean.

Now, was the conviction of Bridges on the Pacific coast, because of Communist activities, of any benefit to your set-up out there in controlling the Communist activities?

Mr. SOARES. Very definitely so. I was sitting in the constitutional convention on opening day when the extra paper appeared, and it was all that the audience there could do to keep from applauding.

Senator MALONE. Then I would take it that Hawaii is not any more fond of Mr. Bridges' activities in trying to carry communism into labor—where I think it never would be if it were not carried in through some outside interference—than our own State of Nevada or any other State.

Mr. SOARES. They are not only not more fond of it, but they are very vocal in expressing their disapproval.

Senator MALONE. I have stated before—and I intend to follow it through further—that if communism is stopped in this country it is going to be labor and veterans who stop it, because these two groups cannot stand Communists. I am glad to hear you say, as the chairman said, that you do not fear it as long as you air it out and have a vote.

Mr. SOARES. That is quite correct.

Senator ANDERSON. Thank you very much.

I would like to insert in the record at this point a wire from Carlton Skinner, Governor of Guam, in which he very clearly points out that the Guamanians are not interested in statehood and that the granting of statehood to Hawaii would not in any way raise any possible obligation to grant statehood to Guam.

There is that question. We are trying to pass a bill, and I happen to be the chairman of the subcommittee which is trying to give some semblance of orderly government to Guam. Governor Skinner points out:

I am informed that in hearings before your committee on Hawaiian statehood a question was raised as to a possible obligation to grant statehood to Guam. Please inform the committee that the people of Guam do not envision or desire statehood. They do ardently desire passage of your bill (S. 1892), now being considered by your committee, which will give them citizenship and right of self-government, which they have patiently sought for the 51 years that they have been under the American flag. The bill for organic act on which Senator Anderson's subcommittee has already held an excellent and sympathetic hearing contains absolutely no promise, direct or implied, of statehood for Guam. By its language describing Guam as an unincorporated territory, the pending bill clearly rejects the possibility of statehood. With citizenship and self-government provided in your bill (S. 1892), the people of Guam will be happy and contented as to their political ambitions and will have the foundation they need to fulfill their destinies politically, economically, and socially.

CARLTON SKINNER,
Governor of Guam

(Sent to Commandant, Twelfth Naval District, San Francisco).

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, at this point I think I should make a short comment, because I think I was responsible for the wire. We had a conference with Mr. Skinner, and I said, "Well, I suppose the next thing you will be doing is asking for statehood." We discussed this very thoroughly, and he thought it would be a detriment to have his bill passed if we thought that. I think I am responsible for the wire.

Senator ANDERSON. I am very glad you did that. I wish that the clerk of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee would also incorporate that telegram into the Guam hearings so that it would not be lost if it is in the Hawaiian hearings only. Incorporate it in our record so that it will be clearly understood that there is no promise expressed or implied in the action we are now taking or contemplate taking on Guam.

Senator MALONE. Of course, Mr. Skinner is an appointee, and he will be short-lived in the history of Guam, and he can make no such commitment. That should be understood.

He is simply the Governor temporarily out there. In my opinion if we set up a government out there, the next thing will be incorporation, and the next thing after that will be an application for statehood if we really get launched into taking in States throughout the Pacific and Atlantic areas.

In other words, personally Mr. Skinner does not desire statehood. He knows he could not get it now anyway, but possibly the next Governor, after he gets the rest of it will desire statehood. I make a prediction that in about 30 years, after we are both gone, they will be after statehood.

Senator ANDERSON. Speak for yourself.

In any event, we should straighten out this question insofar as legislative history can do it. We should read that into the Guamanian record.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I think we should start with Mr. Houston, with the understanding that when the Secretary comes he should yield his place to him temporarily.

Senator ANDERSON. This relates to the provisions of the bill covering the perpetuation of the Hawaiian Homes Act. Will you identify yourself, please?

**STATEMENT OF VICTOR S. K. HOUSTON, CHAIRMAN OF THE
HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION**

Mr. HOUSTON. I am Victor Houston from Honolulu, presently chairman of the Hawaiian Homes Commission. I was born in San Francisco of Part-Hawaiian parentage.

I went to public schools in Norfolk, Va., private schools in Norfolk, Va. I went to school in Switzerland; in Dresden, Germany; and in the public schools of the District of Columbia; and in 1893 I went to the Naval Academy and graduated in 1897.

I remained in the Navy until I was retired in 1926, and was elected the same year as Delegate to Congress to represent the Territory of Hawaii, and served in the Seventieth, the Seventy-first, and the Seventy-second Congresses.

Since that time I have maintained my home in Honolulu and was at one time a member of the police commission in Honolulu, and have been recently a member of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, and more recently was nominated and confirmed as the chairman of the Hawaiian Homes Commission.

I may say that when I was nominated to the police commission and confirmed by the board of supervisors, it was without my previous knowledge of any intention to place me on that commission. I was confirmed without anyone even conferring with me as to whether I could serve.

The same came about when I was appointed to the Hawaiian Homes Commission. It was taken for granted, I assume, that I would serve.

On the 7th of December 1941, I immediately proceeded as a retired officer to Pearl Harbor, and went back on duty and remained on duty until 1945. I was for most of that time the Fourteenth Naval District security officer, and naturally as such was concerned with the actual security of the installations during most of the effective war period.

As a security officer, I can say to you at no time was any report made to me, or did I observe any case, of sabotage or of any indication that sabotage had been tried. We had some very, very dangerous situations there.

There was the bulk storage of gasoline for one, which was within 10 to 15 feet of the main highway running through the island of Oahu. A quarter of a mile away from that storage, around which there was nothing but a wire fence, there was a pump of the Oahu Sugar Co. that was maintained and manned by an alien Japanese, and he remained in that position all throughout the war, so that, if there had been any occasion, there was ample opportunity for terrific damage to be performed. None was performed.

A brand thrown over the fence could have landed right among those millions of barrels of gasoline, which was aviation gasoline. That is the reason it was stored in such containers.

I was married in Honolulu to a girl who was a part Hawaiian, and have since that time remained there and call that my home.

The particular section with which I have been charged to explain in this hearing is with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Commission.

That was an act passed in 1920 under the auspices of Prince Kalaniana'ole, who for nearly 20 years was the Delegate from Hawaii here.

He had been concerned during most of the tenure of his office with the serious reduction in the native Hawaiian population. He died in

1922, so that you can see that through most of the term of his office he was concerned with general matters of legislation for the Territory as a whole, and not until it came to the latter years of his life was he able to bring about the passage of this act, which must have been very near to his heart during all of that time.

The figures with respect to the Hawaiian population have been given to you. I just want to repeat some of them for the purpose of emphasizing, if I may, this matter of the reduction of the Hawaiian population.

It has been estimated that there were about 350,000 Hawaiians at the time of Captain Cook's arrival here. Figures by some have been placed as high as 400,000, but I think the figure of 350,000 can be justified, because later on, as we got the census of the population and spotting those figures and drawing a fair curve back to the period of 1778 when Cook was there, you find that it crosses just at that particular spot, or 350,000.

Fifty years later the population had been reduced by 200,000. That is at the rate of about 50,000 in each 10-year period.

Senator MALONE. To what do you attribute the reduction?

Mr. HOUSTON. I was going to come to that a little bit later, Senator, if I may.

In the next 30-year period the population was halved so that around 1853 there were 71,000 left.

After that, the Hawaiian population was reduced at about the rate of 10,000 every 10 years and later at a rate of about 5,000 each 10-year period, and that reduction continued until the time of the passage of the organic act. Mind you, after annexation it continued to be reduced to the time of 1900, when it reached a low point of 37,600, which was the total figure for all those of Hawaiian blood, either full or part Hawaiian—37,600.

That is the time when Prince Kuhio started thinking about the matter, and when he was able to bring forward a bill in 1920 the Hawaiian population had increased a little bit, so that it had reached the figure of around 42,000 in round numbers. It was 41,000 and a fraction, showing a rate of increase of only about 300 per year.

The reduction of the Hawaiian population was due to two factors: First, the introduction of disease into the Hawaiian Archipelago, to which the Hawaiians had not been accustomed—they had lived there for a matter of five-hundred-odd years completely isolated from the rest of the world. They had none of those diseases from the rest of the world. They had none of those diseases and had not built up in their bodies that resistance to disease that comes from being in contact with disease.

Then, secondly, was the revolution in their civilization, setting up different forms of outward appearance. The temperature of Hawaii—of course it is in the tropical zone. It is almost at the upper limit of the tropical zone, but it is tempered by the trade winds, which winds of course are quite strong, so that, if they wore no clothing, there would not be perspiration, and the difficulty coming from being subjected to the winds did not result in any sickness. But inducing them to wear clothing brought on trouble, and many died from tuberculosis and pneumonia.

Captain Cook was the first to bring in venereal diseases. That is generally understood, but it is not so well known that he also had

with him two men who died of tuberculosis between the visits. He was there two times, in 1778 and 1779. Two of his officers died during that period; one just afterward.

Smallpox, measles, even leprosy, was brought in in the early days, and is one of the scourges to which the Hawaiians have been very seriously subjected.

The Caucasian coming in there with his civilization created a complete revolution, opposed to anything that they had had. Hawaiians lived for comfort. They felt by necessity that they should appear like the Caucasians, and therefore were induced to wear clothing, and it is ironic you might say that only now it is the Caucasian who is taking off his clothes, because he realizes that it is sensible; that to meet the conditions of the climate you should not cover yourself with clothing just for appearance's sake.

Anyhow, those are the reasons perhaps for this reduction of the population, which the Hawaiians, of course, could not understand, but they might have been psychologically affected by the original first reduction of their population, and by having people hammer into their minds that it was a dying population, that may have influenced them.

Then the further influence of the Caucasian became apparent between 1840 and 1849 when the division of land was made, as you were told by other witnesses. The old Hawaiian lived under a semif feudal system. A Hawaiian always had an opportunity to use the land. Usually their living was near the beach.

Now very few Hawaiians have any land holdings near the beach. The Mahele provided in general for a division of it between one-third for the King, one-third the chief, and one-third to the common people, who were known as the Makaainana in the Hawaiian Islands, but when the division of lands was completed, out of a total acreage of about 4,200,000 in round figures, the total of the amount of land that was given to the common people, which was supposed to amount to one-third, was only 28,000 acres divided into 11,000 parcels, and which Prince Kuhio said was divided amongst 3,000 families.

Taking the figures which have been given at the time of the Mahele there were about 75,000 people, and dividing that by five, as constituting a family, that would give you 25,000 family groups. If only 3,000 families got their homes at the time of the Mahele, you will realize that 22,000 Hawaiian families never got any division of lands.

When the Prince came here, the Hawaiian homes bill, having passed in the Hawaiian Legislature, and asked for passage of this measure, it was not on his own initiative but it was the Legislature of Hawaii that asked for this law. There were government lands left, and he asked that some of those lands be given to this set-up which became known as the Hawaiian Homes Commission. A bill went to Congress in 1919, I believe, and finally passed in 1920, and Hawaiian lands were made available. That is the basis of the Hawaiian Homes Act, for which the Prince will always be remembered.

It will be his memorial in Hawaii, and the Hawaiians will always feel that the Congress gave its most sympathetic and kind consideration to the native Hawaiians' aspirations in having a little parcel of land upon which they could go and settle.

Senator MALONE. How many persons was the one-third of the upper strata so-called at one time divided between, how many people?

Mr. HOUSTON. Oh, that was probably not more than 1,500. That is a guess, mind you. I cannot answer that offhand. The chiefs constituted a group of about 1,500 or 2,000 in all, I imagine.

Senator MALONE. Then they have as much land as the 75,000.

Mr. HOUSTON. They have much more land since the chief got about 1,500,000 acres while the common people got only 28,000 acres. You see, this was a situation that was completely new to this group of people who had always lived under a semifeudal tenure in the Kingdom of Hawaii.

It was required that they should come to the capital and make an application for the parcels on which they were living. Then they had to present a survey. There were few surveyed and money was not in common circulation.

At that time they were still bartering mostly, so that it is reasonable to suppose that many of them did not apply because they did not understand what it meant. They did not have the money to pay for a surveyor, nor did they have money to pay for the commutation that followed.

Senator MALONE. This is very interesting concerning the historical growth of the population. All of the native people had access, general access to the beach anyway, did they not, without having to own anything?

Mr. HOUSTON. I do not want to be repetitive, Senator, but the major subdivisions of land ran from the mountain top to the sea and beyond the shore into the sea up to the edge of the reef, so that they could enjoy not only the produce of the land, but also the produce of the sea in their own subdivision, and the villages were along the beaches.

Senator MALONE. Since they had always had this access, they perhaps did not think it necessary, in order to keep the access to the beach, to do all this. They did not realize the importance of it, and now they are prohibited.

Mr. HOUSTON. Now of course when private tenure of land comes to the beach, that means the public cannot go through that private tenure.

In some places near Honolulu even this is the case. There in the Kahala area if you recall, out there, that runs for a mile and a half without a single public right-of-way down to it. As a matter of fact, in that area there are 17 to 19 private rights-of-way which only the occupiers of the leases of the bishop of estate can use.

Now the Homes Commission, the bill provides for the assigning to the Commission, of about 180,000 acres of land by act of Congress. The act, for the purpose of settling those parcels, provides that Hawaiians of 50 percent or more Hawaiian blood should be selected.

The bill provides that house lots may be granted, or agricultural lots, of from 1 to 40 acres, or pastoral lots of from 100 to 250 acres, first-class grazing land, and from 250 to 1,000 acres of second-class grazing land.

It also provides for a revolving fund so that loans may be made to the homesteaders for the purpose of starting them into business.

During the first 5 years of the life of the Homes Commission, only the lands on Molokai and certain lands on Hawaii were made available. That was to be a trial period at the end of which Congress was petitioned to have it extended to the balance of the lands.

At the end of the trial period, it was declared that the project was a success and that it should be extended to all of the islands. We get money from the rentals of available lands that are not used by the Homes Commission, because we cannot open them all up at the same time since there is not money in any fund that can provide for the opening. The legislature provides for opening certain parcels, and also provides for the administrative fund.

There are at the present time 1,337 homesteaders in the various projects, with a total population of 6,517, and a total number of children of 2,798 who are still living with their parents.

In every respect it may be said that it has brought the Hawaiians back to life, and I may say, to show you the success in arresting the decrease in the population, that the figures as of the 1st of January of this year show that from a low of 37,600, there are now 85,000 Hawaiians and part Hawaiians.

The question will be brought up by the next witness, because he is opposed to the continuation of the projects, probably on the so-called constitutional grounds.

Senator MALONE. How many acres are now in your project at this time that have not been definitely disposed of to the people?

Mr. HOUSTON. About 103,000.

Senator MALONE. Is it the objective of your Commission to finally make disposal, complete disposal, of these lands to private ownership?

Mr. HOUSTON. Eventually as we can get appropriations.

Senator MALONE. Just as fast as it can be brought about?

Mr. HOUSTON. There is a limitation of not more than 20,000 acres in any one 5-year period.

Senator MALONE. Well, why do you need the appropriation?

Mr. HOUSTON. To bring water in, and roads, and for subdividing it. Water is the great need to prepare the land for settlement.

Senator MALONE. It is not possible for the population itself to work that out if they own the land?

Mr. HOUSTON. No, Senator. Water is the crux of the situation.

Senator MALONE. Where does the water have to come from?

Mr. HOUSTON. From the mountains, usually. The areas, as you know, are in many places arid. On Oahu most of the water comes from underground sources. The terrain is pumped up, but on other islands there is no artesian basin. It is so porous that the rainfall just seeps right through.

Senator MALONE. Well, if you do get water which you have to pump, even though it was not artesian, is it ocean water or salty water?

Mr. HOUSTON. Oh, no, it is fresh water.

Senator MALONE. Then they could pump water out.

Mr. HOUSTON. If there is an artesian source.

Senator MALONE. Well, there are many places in this country where it is not artesian, but where water that will accumulate in a well and be pumped.

Mr. HOUSTON. We are not so fortunate in Hawaii.

Senator MALONE. What is the water table below the surface? I suppose it depends on elevation above sea level.

Mr. HOUSTON. It depends. The only place we have driven a well, we had to go down a thousand feet, more or less.

Senator MALONE. That is what elevation above sea level?

Mr. HOUSTON. That was driven between 500 and 600 feet.

Senator MALONE. Above sea level?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Senator MALONE. That would go down 500 feet below sea level?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Senator MALONE. You found fresh water?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

The question of constitutionality is what may be brought up, and in that connection in the report of the house committee on territories, when the homes commission bill was before it, they gave this opinion. It was a subparagraph headed "Constitutionality" and it reads as follows:

In the opinion of your committee there is no constitutional difficulty whatever involved in setting aside and developing lands of the Territory for native Hawaiians only. The privileges and immunities clause of the Constitution, and the due process and equal protection clauses of the fourteenth amendment thereto, are prohibitions having reference to State action only, but even without this defense, the legislation is based upon a reasonable and not an arbitrary classification and is thus not unconstitutional class legislation. Further, there are numerous congressional precedents for such legislation in previous enactments granting Indians and soldiers and sailors special privileges in obtaining and using the public lands. Your committee's opinion is further substantiated by the brief of the attorney general of Hawaii (see hearings, pp. 162-164) and the written opinion of the solicitor of the Department of the Interior (see hearings, pp. 130-131).

May I submit that for the record?

Senator ANDERSON. Yes.

We will break into your testimony at this time because the Secretary of the Interior is here.

Mr. HOUSTON. May I introduce some further opinions as to the constitutionality?

Senator ANDERSON. Is it relatively long or relatively short?

Mr. HOUSTON. I would rather read some parts of them afterward if I may come back again. If not I will submit the whole paper.

Senator ANDERSON. Mr. Secretary, we are glad to welcome you back.

STATEMENT OF HON. OSCAR L. CHAPMAN, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Secretary CHAPMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to return to the hearing. I had intended to have a conference with Mr. Farrington to see if he was getting ready to close up these hearings and cut down on the number of witnesses, because I thought that by this time the testimony might be getting a little repetitious.

Senator ANDERSON. I will say that the Delegate has been striving hard this morning to have all witnesses heard, even though briefly. He has done a fine job.

Mr. FARRINGTON. We had a schedule that would have concluded all of the testimony this morning, but unfortunately we have about 1 hour more of testimony, so that we can give representation to some of our people who have come here. If they can proceed without interruption, I think we can conclude in an hour after the Secretary has made his talk.

Senator ANDERSON. I think, if you do not mind, Secretary Chapman, we will proceed with you.

I would particularly like to have your comment on the statement that Senator Butler prepared. When you have completed your testimony, I am going to leave with Senator Taylor some questions that were proposed to me to be asked with reference to this Hawaiian Homes Commission.

I do not know anything about the questions, but I think if there is a curiosity on these points, we might as well cover that, and Senator Taylor will go on with the hearing this afternoon. I hope to attend, but I have some responsibilities on the floor this afternoon.

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I believe that people who have come this far should certainly be heard even if we have to hold a night session.

Senator ANDERSON. I will be very happy to hold an evening session.

Senator MALONE. I would be very willing to.

Senator ANDERSON. I thought you would, George.

I am sure that the Alaskan crowd will admit that when they had their hearing we tried our very best to give them a full and respectful hearing. We intend to do the same thing for the Hawaiians, as you have suggested, and we will go on and get the job done somehow. Proceed, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to do this. I have not read the statement of Senator Butler. I was just advised that he had submitted a statement for the record, commenting upon what is called the walk-out of certain members of the Democratic Party in their convention.

Senator MALONE. Mr. Secretary, that is not unusual, is it?

Secretary CHAPMAN. Not unusual at all. As a matter of fact, it seems to be rather healthy, the walk-out. I am very glad you raised that, Senator Malone.

The Democratic Party has been anything but unanimous and harmonious all the way through in its deliberations in conventions. I have known other conventions in which delegates walked out, and we have not gotten some of them back yet, but that is all right. I think it is a healthy thing, and I am not going to object to it. That is a part of the democratic system under which we work.

I will attempt in a few minutes to sum up for you, although you have other witnesses to testify before you, as to what I think this situation is, and what I think it leads to. I did not come before you the other day or this morning totally unprepared, without an idea, or without having heard or seen something about Hawaii. I have never been to Hawaii. I have never been to Alaska; but I have read more memoranda on Alaska and Hawaii than any man living. I have read a great deal about Hawaiian affairs and about the day-to-day business of the Territory.

Now is there anyone on this committee who doubts the sincerity of Governor Stainback, that he has fought the Communist issue in Hawaii these years and led the fight against communism? Is there any doubt about that?

I want Governor Stainback to stand up. I do not want to embarrass anybody, but I want to face this thing straight once and for all. You are for statehood?

Governor STAINBACK. Yes, sir.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Regardless of what this statement says?

Governor STAINBACK. I think we will take care of the so-called Communists when we get back.

Secretary CHAPMAN. You are for statehood. You knew about this walk-out? You heard about it afterward?

Governor STAINBACK. After I came here.

Secretary CHAPMAN. And you still are for statehood?

Governor STAINBACK. Yes, sir.

Secretary CHAPMAN. All right.

Senator MALONE. Mr. Secretary, at that point my remark was a little facetious. Even Republicans have walk-outs. I did read Senator Butler's statement, and I think he had reference mostly to something more deep-seated, kind of an undertow there, and I had asked one of the witnesses, which I intend to ask you, if the conviction of Mr. Bridges might clear the air a little bit out there.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Well, I think if you would keep a lot of Californians out of Hawaii, we would be better off.

Now I have a great respect for Californians, as I have for people from Nevada or any other State, but when you turn Harry Bridges loose in Hawaii, he can cause a lot of damage, just as he could in Nebraska and Nevada, except that they do not happen to have a port which he could organize.

Senator MALONE. He tried to move in there and the boys met him at the port.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Men like Governor Stainback will take care of that issue of communism within the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party will take care of the Communist issue within its own party, and I do not care whether it is in Hawaii, in Nevada or Colorado or anywhere else, we will meet that.

Senator MALONE. At that point, Mr. Secretary, I wish to say that you are a westerner and you know we are not very sympathetic with them out there. Mr. Bridges was up once before, and probably the evidence was not much different than it was this time, but the situation was different.

Secretary CHAPMAN. No, I think the evidence was quite different this time, Senator. When it was presented to the court they had positive witnesses this time that they did not have the first time. They had documents this time that they did not have the first time.

Senator MALONE. Well, the first time there was no doubt in anyone's mind but that he was a Communist, but there was a certain interference at the time that kept the thing from coming to a show-down, and I do not think this is the place to bring that up.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I do not think so either.

Senator MALONE. But it was there.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I do not think that fits into this.

Senator ANDERSON. Are you satisfied that this situation can be controlled? We had a very fine statement from the chairman of the Republican central committee out there that he was not worried about it. He was convinced that it could be handled.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I had a call yesterday from the mayor of Honolulu. I do not know whether he and Governor Stainback agree generally and politically or not. I do not know whether they are in the same faction within the party.

I do not attempt to keep up with the local political factions among them, but the mayor of Honolulu phoned me yesterday and said, "There

have been some difficulties out here that might be exaggerated, and I wanted you to know that there is nothing serious about this walk-out one way or another except that there is a difference of opinion, and we do want to kick the Communists out of the picture if we can, and we are going to do it our way. Let us do it."

I do not know what he had in mind but he is the mayor and evidently many people have confidence in him.

Senator CORDON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to interrupt.

Senator ANDERSON. Senator Cordon.

Senator CORDON. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to hear the Secretary. It does not make any difference what he says. He does not know any more about this than I do.

Secretary CHAPMAN. That is right, you have been there.

Senator CORDON. I do not know anything about this affair, and frankly if there is a situation such as indicated in this statement of Senator Butler's that has come up since this hearing started, so far as I am concerned—and I think I am one of the members of this committee and of the Senate who cannot be accused of being anti-Hawaiian statehood—if that situation has occurred out there, I want information before my committee before I act, as to what actually happened. We are entitled to have it. The Senate is entitled to have it.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I think you are.

Senator CORDON. And the people are entitled to have it from somebody who knows. I do not know. I was not there, and neither was Senator Butler there. According to the first paragraph of his statement he got the story from some newspaper clippings. I am sure that is true. All I am saying to you is this—

Senator BUTLER. I would like to just say one word, because I am fearful of your comments in bringing Governor Stainback into this picture. I want to assure you and everybody else from Hawaii or any place else in the United States, that no one is shooting at Governor Stainback. If there is any citizen of the United States that has done a magnificent job in his official capacity, I think it is the Governor.

Secretary CHAPMAN. So do I. That is the reason I asked him to stand up, and that is the reason I knew that he would stand foreshore on what he believed is right. He believed that communism was wrong in Hawaii and was getting too much of a foothold. He fought it.

Now he has fought Communism in Hawaii and he is coming here to tell you today that he wants statehood for Hawaii. I believe his testimony in favor of statehood should have some bearing on this thing.

I believe you should give weight to that kind of testimony. Now we go ahead and talk about what the political complexion of Hawaii is. It is generally conceded that Hawaii would probably be Republican.

I might say to you that it is my personal belief—and I am no Gallup poll; I would not attempt to be that type of a prognosticator of any political situation—I say here are the two gentlemen [indicating Delegate Farrington and Mr. King] I think they would be elected to the Senate of the United States. They would be your first two Senators. I do not think there would be any question about it.

I have no objection to that. I do not agree with their political philosophy, but I agree that their integrity cannot be questioned by any member of this committee or by anybody else. They believe in statehood; they want statehood; they have asked for it. They have come to the committee and laid their case before you.

Let me say this. No State was ever admitted to the Union with as much information placed on the record as you have in this case of Hawaii. No State, including Nebraska, when a Senator got up on the floor and said, "I do not believe Nebraska should yet become a member of the Union because of fraud involved in its election," because they permitted two regiments of soldiers to vote in that Territory when they were trying to qualify a sufficient number of residents. They said that even after Nebraska was admitted to the Union, but the Congress never went back to try to correct the fraud. They realized the rights of the people in Nebraska should be protected.

Their civil rights had something to do with it, and so they let the fraud diminish itself by the rights of the people being asserted in coming to the top. They did not attempt to go back to hold hearings on the so-called fraud that was alleged on the floor of the Senate when Nebraska was admitted to the Union, and I do not think they should have.

Senator MALONE. Mr. Secretary, I do not think that anybody questions the honesty and integrity of Joe Farrington, certainly no member of this committee.

Senator BUTLER. Or Mr. King.

Senator MALONE. Or Sam King. They are too well known.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Then what are we worrying about?

Senator MALONE. Well, I will tell you. In my humble opinion there are many things that go into the matters of statehood besides Communists.

Secretary CHAPMAN. That is right.

Senator MALONE. And there are many shades of security risks. They do not all carry Communist cards.

Secretary CHAPMAN. That is right.

Senator MALONE. And there are a couple of points that the junior Senator from Nevada wants cleared in his own mind. I am not ready to vote for statehood. I have not made up my mind, but if I had to vote now I would vote against it, and I will tell you why.

We have just gone over the population. We have just gone over the number of what someone here called alien citizens. That was brought up.

Now we have digested that a little. There is one other thing, one other reason why I am not ready to vote for statehood yet. One decision to make is whether or not we are going to take States into the Union of noncontiguous areas.

Secretary CHAPMAN. That is right; that is one of the decisions.

Senator MALONE. Now, once that decision is made, I would say to the distinguished Secretary, whom I have known for 30 years very favorably, and spoke for him in the committee and would again, that there is no reason if you make up your mind that noncontiguous areas, regardless of distance, are going to be taken in as States, why Puerto Rico, when they are finally incorporated and come along and want to

be a State, which they once did want, should not be admitted as a State. They had their application in, and we went down to take a look.

We have Guam, and no doubt it will qualify economically sometime regardless of the statement of the present Governor. He could not commit anybody beyond himself.

We have Okinawa; we have other areas that are on the verge of applying for statehood, like Newfoundland. Two or three years ago they sent an emissary down here. Once break it, if we do—and I say now I am not against that, but I am just studying it—you would have representation in the Congress of the United States of noncontiguous areas 1,500, 2,000, maybe up to 3,000 miles away, that perhaps all together might control the Senate of the United States. People with no particular idea of just how the United States was set up in the first place or its ideals or its methods of governing itself.

We have some very severe differences of opinion on the Senate floor now, and to bring in representatives of noncontiguous areas that know very little except their own area, I claim it is one of the most serious things that we have to decide, and that must be decided.

No one is questioning the integrity of Governor Stainback. I was there during the war. I just said that a while ago before the Secretary came in. Admiral Nimitz called his whole staff together. Then I went to Mr. Richardson and to Governor Stainback and to the then president of the University of Hawaii.

I was sent there to get the picture and then went out to New Guinea to do the same thing.

Economically and in a lot of ways they are even ahead of some of our own States, but there are some fundamental questions, and I did not want the record to show that any of us question the integrity of anyone who is here, least of all the officials of this Government. We do not question the sincerity of the witnesses who come here with their story, but they have their particular fields. They are not here trying to judge the fundamentals that enter into statehood.

Now, I shall listen very carefully to the Secretary of the Interior.

Secretary CHAPMAN. May I answer you on that?

Senator MALONE. You can answer me or just make your statement.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Let me answer that specific question, because you have to decide, in considering statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, whether you are going to admit Territories noncontiguous to the other States. You have already done that under the Constitution of the United States as laid down when you admitted California.

It was noncontiguous to any other State. Now you can say it was a part of the continent, but between it and the States was a great land barrier that was not a part of the Union. It was only in a Territorial stage.

Now let me go one step further. I like the analogy that you made of Puerto Rico. The Constitution of the United States does not now apply to any organized Territories other than Hawaii and Alaska. Hawaii was a republic.

Senator MALONE. But I might say at that point it is merely a question of deciding to do that.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Well, you can decide whether to incorporate other areas some other day. That does not have to be decided in this statehood bill.

Senator MALONE. That is true.

Secretary CHAPMAN. You cannot bind the next Congress as to what they want to do in any event, any more than you could bind my successor under the law.

Senator MALONE. If I may say so, Mr. Secretary, and to the people who have come 5,000 miles to be heard, no member of this committee questions their testimony, their sincerity. They are giving facts. If we can keep it on the basis of the sincerity of everyone—

Secretary CHAPMAN. Let us assume everybody is sincere. I do not want to accuse anybody of ulterior motives. I do not question anybody's motives. Then we start off even. Now you have not extended the Constitution of the United States to Guam and to Puerto Rico.

Senator MALONE. It is very easy to do that.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Well, that is up to Congress to do it when it gets ready to do it under a separate bill. It has nothing to do with statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

Senator MALONE. I do not think you really understand my point. My point is this: and when you have the economic set-up necessary, and the number of people you think necessary for a State, it is a very easy thing, once you have broken it, the one thing of noncontiguous areas, for other Territories to demand to be brought in.

Now as far as California is concerned, the thing is that it all belonged to the United States, and it simply was a matter of time and meeting the necessary requirements. They were all right here together.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I am sorry you were not here when I made my opening statement the first day. I said that day in my testimony, if you will read it, that this was a noncontiguous area.

There were honest people who believed that the distance from Hawaii to the mainland of California made it a serious barrier to becoming a State, but I said that I did not believe that that was a valid objection because I did not believe that under our present transportation system that could legitimately be an issue.

I think Hawaii can be a State just as Colorado or Nevada are. I do not think that distance is relevant today as it might have been 25 years ago. That applies to Alaska also.

Remember that Hawaii pays an income tax into the Treasury of the United States. The people of Puerto Rico do not pay an income tax. They have never petitioned Congress to become a State.

Senator MALONE. I beg your pardon.

Secretary CHAPMAN. No, no, they have never filed a formal petition to ask that of Congress. Their legislative body has never even passed a resolution asking that that be done, Senator. Let us have it. Where is it? It has never been filed. You have had a group agitating for statehood in Puerto Rico, I know that, but today the Governor will tell you they do not want statehood.

Senator MALONE. The Governor at that time did not tell us that.

Secretary CHAPMAN. But even if he does, you pass on that. Each Congress has the right to pass on that when they reach it.

Senator MALONE. After we passed on it, there was a bill introduced here. Then they changed their minds apparently.

Secretary CHAPMAN. It did not have the support of the Department of the Interior.

Senator MALONE. Well, there have been things that were passed that did not have that support.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Surely, there have been many things passed without the support of our Department.

Senator ANDERSON. Mr. Secretary, may I just interrupt to ask a question on this one matter. Senator Cordon has raised a question with reference to this statement.

Now Senator Butler, when he introduced the statement, was, I thought, very fair and very fine about it. He said this was purely a report, but he did believe we should have information on it.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I agree with him.

Senator ANDERSON. Do you not think that while these hearings are being printed and we are getting around to the point of trying to decide in the committee what will be done with Hawaiian statehood, that we should have specific and definite information on the point raised by Senator Butler and Senator Cordon, and don't we have time enough to get it ?

Secretary CHAPMAN. We have time enough to get it. I will get and submit to this committee statements from people that I am sure you will not question irrespective of the fact that they may belong to a different political party. I do not believe you will question their integrity or the facts.

Senator BUTLER. That makes no difference to me.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I know it does not, Senator, and that is why I say that to you. I have respect for you. If I did not, I would not argue with you. I am trying to win your support. If I did not believe you were sincere in your position, I would not waste time arguing about it.

Now I will get for this committee a statement of facts as to who walked out of that convention and why, the very best I can.

Senator CORDON. Mr. Secretary, we are also interested in who stayed in and did not walk out.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I would like to know that, too. I think it is more important to know about who stayed in than who walked out. I want to know for myself.

Senator BUTLER. In my statement I have given no names, but I have listed the number.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I think it is important to know who stayed in and who walked out.

Mr. Wilson, who is the mayor of Honolulu, indicated to me that he did not walk out, and I do not think anybody here, or the Un-American Activities Committee, ever questioned his loyalty to the Government.

Senator BUTLER. He used to be a citizen of Omaha.

Secretary CHAPMAN. That is right, he had good background, good training. These folks go from Nebraska to Hawaii and the first thing you know they are running the place. That is all right, I am for it, and I say this to you in all fairness.

There are so many things, some things that Senator Malone has raised here, that have to be decided when you decide on statehood.

It is not just one question that you decide. There are several questions that you will have to decide when you decide the statehood question.

I have tried to bring before this committee every piece of information that it is possible to obtain for you. There has never been a State admitted to the Union about which there was as much information in the record as Hawaii has presented. I was not being critical, Senator, when I spoke of Nebraska, but it just so happens that Nebraska was a State where the question of fraud was raised 2 or 3 years after it had elected its Senators.

Now I simply mention that these questions will come up all the time. We will have charges made here and there by different people who disagree with us, and when I spoke to you of these two eminent gentlemen here, politically I may be wrong, because I have not been to Hawaii, but my belief is you will probably find these two men elected to be the first Senators to come down here.

Senator ANDERSON. They stand pretty well with the home folks.

Senator MALONE. They stand well down here.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I think they stand well not only at home but in Washington.

Now I say that not to influence your decision, but to give you a rounded picture of what the whole story looks like. How can we turn our backs on the Hawaiian people? How can we turn our backs on the civil rights of those people?

For 50 years they have waited for statehood, and I say waited because there is a direct commitment by this Government that they would eventually become a State. I think the good faith of this Government is at stake.

Senator MALONE. What is the commitment?

Secretary CHAPMAN. The commitment is that when Hawaii was incorporated in 1900 it would be given the privilege of becoming a State. It is in writing and in print and signed by the President of the United States, and it is in the records of this hearing. There is no question about that.

Hawaii stands on its own feet, on its own merits different from any other State in the Union. It was a republic to start with. It had an organized governing body. Like the State of Texas, it was a republic.

There is no public land in Hawaii to speak of except in a very minor way. It is different from any of the other Western States.

Senator BUTLER. It is my understand that it is about one-fourth of it.

Secretary CHAPMAN. It is a fraction of the total acreage, Senator. There is a very small fraction of it involved. If you take into consideration what the Navy and the Army and the military, all the Military Establishments, control, and what we have in the national park you probably have a million and a half acres altogether.

Senator MALONE. I think that is a point in their favor.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I think it is a great point in their favor. They gave us that national park. It is supposed to be a beautiful park, and I hope to see it after you have given them statehood. I am not going to Hawaii until they get statehood.

I say this with all sincerity. I never appeared before a committee before in my 17 years' experience feeling as deeply as I do about this

issue. I feel we are depriving those people of their civil rights as citizens of the United States, and I think the day has passed when we can afford to delay it any longer, because of the rumors or statements printed in the press. I am going to clear this up with a complete statement, Senator Butler, and I am going to put it in the record, and I think it will be a complete answer to this, and if there is any doubt in your mind about it after that, then of course there is nothing I can say. If you are still opposed to statehood then, I am sorry.

Senator BUTLER. All I am looking for, Mr. Secretary, is the facts, the truth.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I believe you are, Senator, and I have complete confidence in that statement. I want to give you the facts on this convention walk-out.

Senator MALONE. I say, too, Mr. Secretary, I do not think anyone in the committee doubts your sincerity and your convictions on the evidence you have.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Thank you, Senator. Let me say this: Never has an organized Territory presented itself before this Congress with better credentials to become a State than Hawaii and if you are going to turn down Hawaii, we had better turn back the pages and look at some of our own States.

Senator MALONE. Well, Mr. Secretary, now to me—this is repetitious—there are things to be considered here that were not to be considered in the States that are now in the Union.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Twenty-five years ago I would have said that was a valid problem, Senator, that the distance might raise a serious question, but with the transportation services available today, by which Governor Stainback can leave Honolulu and be here within 24 hours, and when you can leave here and be in Juneau, Alaska, within 24 hours, that is not a question any more.

Senator MALONE. You know, Mr. Secretary, it has been suggested that we might take in 16 States that we are more or less supporting now over in Europe, and you can do the same thing with Paris. I have stepped on a plane here and landed there at midnight.

Secretary CHAPMAN. You raised this as an issue in Hawaii.

Senator MALONE. I am raising it there.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I want Ireland to be free. It does not want to be a member of this Union.

Senator MALONE. I am not so sure.

Secretary CHAPMAN. It fought for a hundred years to get from under the heel of England, and I am glad it won, and it does not want to be a State of the Union.

Senator MALONE. I would not be so sure.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I am talking for Ireland. Ireland does not want to be a State. It would not ask this Congress to become a State of the Union.

Senator MALONE. Mr. Secretary, if they did apply for statehood and we took Hawaii, it is not any further from the seat of government than Hawaii is.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Then the wisdom of this Congress would have to determine that under our democratic process. The democratic processes of this country are adequate to decide whether you want to take them or not.

Senator MALONE. Mr. Secretary, I want to clarify this airplane business a little. How much is the population there?

Secretary CHAPMAN. Approximately half a million, 445,000 being citizens.

Senator MALONE. All those people cannot ride on an airplane every day, while in Colorado, Nevada, and other places they can hitchhike pretty near any place, but there have been a relatively few, and there would be over a good many years relatively few, of the population that would go outside of Hawaii, because it is just too far to reach the mainland. The leaders could, of course.

I have heard a lot about this one-world business, that we are so close now we have to level the standards of living and bring everybody up together.

I believe in the long run that may be, maybe in a century or so instead of a matter of years. There must be questions of fact taken into consideration.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Surely, and this record is so full of facts, Senator, that you would not finish reading it if you started now, until Congress closes. You could not finish reading it all.

Where would you expect those people to go other than to the United States? You were not present the other day when I referred to the fact that the speaker of the house, who is of Chinese ancestry, was elected with less than 4 or 5 percent of the population being Chinese. Who elected him? The Anglo-Saxons, and those of Japanese ancestry, elected him because of his ability.

Who was the president of the senate? Another product of our American institutions. They go back for the leadership of the people. How else would you do this? Are you going to say forever that Hawaii can never become a State because it is an island community?

Senator MALONE. Mr. Secretary, I happened to be the one conducting the investigations into the Japanese camps during the war, and graduates of California University were in those camps, and some of their children said they would not be loyal.

Secretary CHAPMAN. You did not have any Japanese from Hawaii in those camps. There was not one single case of subversiveness or sabotage reported by the FBI or the Military Intelligence Service during the entire course of the war.

Senator MALONE. I complimented them a while ago on that very thing.

Secretary CHAPMAN. So did I. I investigated those camps. I went into every camp of America that the Japanese were confined in. I thought it was a tragedy that the military felt it was necessary to remove them from their homes.

Senator MALONE. After they removed them, you had someone in charge of those camps.

Secretary CHAPMAN. You bet we did.

Senator MALONE. And we had to take charge of them.

Secretary CHAPMAN. That is right, we paid for it. The American Government paid a tremendous price for it.

Senator MALONE. What I say, the Senate Military Affairs Committee had to step in and straighten it out.

Secretary CHAPMAN. What did you straighten out?

Senator MALONE. We made the recommendations you later followed.

Secretary CHAPMAN. You made the recommendation that it be transferred to the Interior Department, and we took it over, and Dillon Myer, who is now Commissioner of Indian Affairs, was put in charge.

Senator MALONE. He was in charge when you had the trouble.

Secretary CHAPMAN. But he was not in Interior. He was running a five-man combination coordination proposition. That is what he was doing.

Senator MALONE. But he was not coordinating.

Secretary CHAPMAN. No one could coordinate.

Senator MALONE. We made the recommendations that you followed. You took the disloyal ones and quit pampering them.

Secretary CHAPMAN. We did not just take the disloyal ones. We took all the Japanese.

Senator MALONE. Not in that one camp.

Secretary CHAPMAN. We put them in a different camp. We had them in a half dozen camps.

Senator MALONE. I think we are off the subject.

Secretary CHAPMAN. We are. I could discuss that all day with you.

Senator MALONE. I am going to clear this up. You built a stockade at the edge of Oregon there, and put the tough ones in it because we recommended that you do it. Now let us get off of that and get back on the other.

Secretary CHAPMAN. We did that.

Senator MALONE. Because we recommended it.

Secretary CHAPMAN. We did it, but we did not do it to any Japanese in Hawaii.

Senator MALONE. I am the one that complimented these regiments. I brought it up myself.

Secretary CHAPMAN. You did.

Senator MALONE. Now the thing I am trying to say is that we are clear away from the fundamentals. We all admit economically they are all right. We all admit that these leaders are fine people and that they are earnest, and we know you are.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Then you are ready to vote for statehood.

Senator MALONE. Then I am not ready to vote for statehood because of the thing I brought up.

Secretary CHAPMAN. What, the distance?

Senator MALONE. No; not the distance. People cannot come across 2,000 miles of water, the ordinary people that have no means, but they can go across the State line of Colorado into Utah.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Well, then, Senator, under that thesis I could never hope to win your vote for Hawaiian statehood because I cannot move the islands any closer. Hawaii is as close as we can get it. This is not facetious. This is serious.

Senator MALONE. It is serious for me, too.

Secretary CHAPMAN. These people have asked that their rights be given to them under the Constitution of the United States, which was extended to them by the Congress. Let us give them their civil rights now.

Senator MALONE. Mr. Secretary, you may be in the wrong job.

Secretary CHAPMAN. I may be.

Senator MALONE. In other words, it is up to this committee to determine those questions, and we are hearing you and we know what you think about it.

Secretary CHAPMAN. That is right, and I am trying to give you the facts.

Senator MALONE. And the facts are just as I tried to give them, that if you admit a State 2,000 miles away from the mainland, there is

no reason why you should not admit any nation in the world as a State if it meets the same qualifications.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Senator, that is for the Congress to decide when the question is presented to it.

Senator MALONE. And this is, too.

Secretary CHAPMAN. And this is for this Congress to decide. This is before this Congress now.

Senator MALONE. We agree on that.

Secretary CHAPMAN. Now we are together. That question is for this Congress to decide, and I think you should decide it in its favor.

Senator BUTLER. I want to say just one word with reference to the movement of the Japanese-Americans from the West Coast to the interior. We, in Nebraska, helped educate a lot of them, and they were good students in the school where I am chairman of the board of trustees.

Secretary CHAPMAN. That is right, you very definitely did so, Senator. You took a lot of those students in when we could not get them into some other communities up West, and I want to compliment you and your leading citizens of Nebraska for doing it to help them.

Senator CORDON. Mr. Chairman, I am going to have to leave. I just want to have the attention of the Chairman if I may for a moment.

From time to time, Mr. Chairman, the question has arisen on the extent of the investigations made on this statehood question, and with reference to completeness, the comprehensiveness of such investigation. At my request, representatives of the Statehood Commission have compiled an index of those congressional hearings under tropical headings, some sixty-odd topical headings, with all eight hearings indexed under those 68 topics, making a very convenient reference both for this committee and for others who may be interested in getting information on any of the topics. I believe it would be most helpful if the index itself could be included in this printed hearing so that it will coordinate this hearing with the other eight hearings, and I ask that the complete index be made a part of this record.

Senator ANDERSON. Without objection it will be done.

INDEX OF CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS ON STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Eight Congressional investigations on the question of admitting Hawaii to statehood have been made since 1935. The date, authorization, and locale of these hearings are as follows:

- (1) 1935, October 7-18, H. R. 3034, Hawaii.
- (2) 1937, October 6-22, Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, Hawaii.
- (3) 1946, January 7-18, House Resolution 236, Hawaii.
- (4) 1947, March 7-19, H. R. 49 and 10 other identical bills, Washington.
- (5) 1948, January 5-20, H. R. 49 and S. 114, Hawaii.
- (6) 1948, April 15, H. R. 49 and S. 114, Washington.
- (7) 1948, November 1-12, H. R. 49 and S. 114, Hawaii.
- (8) 1949, March 3 and 8, H. R. 49 and related bills, Washington.

Agriculture:

Page

1935	12, 207-208
1937	177-179,
	193-194, 197-198, 200-204, 209, 409, 574-575, 577, 631-639
1946	51, 88-100,
	224, 234-235, 306-308, 321-326, 581, 624-625, 632-633, 686-687, 830
1947	128
1948	297-310, 331-338, 387-399
1949	33

Aliens :	Page
1935-----	10, 19, 189, 199, 221, 232, 243, 287
1937-----	13, 58, 114-115, 138, 164, 179-180, 185, 188-189, 199-200, 297, 319-320, 322, 344, 356-357, 373-374, 421-422, 486-487, 527-528, 533-535, 539, 578-579, 654, 655
1946-----	38, 463-465, 600
1947-----	157, 173-174
1948-----	7, 87, 96-97
1949-----	56
Americanization :	
1935-----	10, 24, 34, 39, 41, 42, 54, 71, 83, 87, 97, 118, 123, 129, 131, 135, 141, 159, 160, 173, 175, 182, 189, 204, 208, 214, 227, 230, 233, 245, 248, 250, 253, 256, 261.
1937-----	46, 183-185, 199, 230, 232-233, 242-243, 266-267, 274-277, 296, 302-303, 314, 327-328, 352, 373-375, 378, 417-418, 432-434, 436-437, 439, 454-455, 469-473, 479, 480, 486-487, 499-500, 503-504, 514-515-517, 520-523, 526, 535, 542-543, 546, 561-568, 573-574, 579.
1946-----	530-536, 542
1948-----	141, 149-150, 157-158, 163, 167-168, 176-179, 197-200, 208-209, 236-237, 247, 249-252, 260, 312, 314-316, 325-326, 358-359, 379-381, 465-466.
1949-----	34
Annexation :	
1935-----	33, 51, 60, 101, 110-111, 119, 125, 138, 144, 152, 158, 163, 168-169, 183, 188, 211, 222, 224, 283, 285-286.
1937-----	105, 118, 182-183, 238, 253, 265, 277, 278, 381-382, 387-388, 403, 415-417, 510-513, 572, 583-584.
1946-----	12-13, 21, 281
1947-----	37, 60, 96, 103, 131, 144
1948-----	56, 121-122, 182
1949-----	53
Banks :	
1935-----	108-109
1937-----	24, 27, 28, 37-38, 422-423, 511, 641-642
1946-----	678-679
1947-----	31
1948-----	448-460
Big Five :	
1935-----	110, 113, 164, 182, 233
1937-----	12-13, 16-18, 20-23, 51-52, 65-66, 71-76, 86-88, 90-92, 106-107, 111, 118- 119, 132-133, 154-160, 165, 167, 175-179, 193, 265-266, 275-276, 277-278, 285-288, 383-385, 389-390, 403, 465-466, 516, 528-529, 574-577.
1946-----	112-115, 133-134, 135, 138, 139, 222-235, 246, 264-265, 295, 341, 342-343, 358- 359, 431-432, 459-460, 474-475, 482-484, 500, 507, 532, 539, 783.
1947-----	16, 45, 118, 129, 188-189, 193-194
1948-----	138, 228-229, 230, 234-235, 273, 277, 350, 383, 447, 465-466
1949-----	36
Bloc voting :	
1935-----	29, 71, 90, 98, 127, 173-174, 176, 179, 200, 204
1937-----	54, 181, 199-200, 211-213, 239, 282, 284, 307-308, 351, 480, 590
1946-----	9, 28, 29, 65-66, 130, 134-135, 139, 215-216, 244-245, 248, 260, 320, 330-333, 336, 338, 342, 440, 447, 458-459, 466-467, 474, 528-529, 622-624.
1947-----	57, 121
1948-----	3, 25, 42, 44, 51, 60, 65, 69, 79-80, 82, 88, 106, 129, 131-132, 138, 142, 152-154, 165-167, 174-175, 185, 191, 202, 222-223, 227, 229, 240, 295, 384, 438-439.
1949-----	11, 15, 33

Business:**Page**

1935	315, 317
1937	27-28, 34-35, 176, 235-236, 574-577, 639-654
1946	419-422, 583, 608-609, 668-675, 702-703, 875-881
1947	55, 57, 60, 104, 182-183
1948	18-19, 122-126, 131-132, 147-151, 207, 368, 446
1949	34

Citizenship:

1935	14-15, 32, 135, 141, 161, 222, 249-250, 255
1937	40-42, 46-48, 56-57, 59, 66, 69-70, 93-94, 112-116, 124, 146-153, 170-171, 173, 179-180, 188-190, 200, 227, 245-246, 269-270, 279, 282-284, 288-292, 294-295, 302-303, 305, 308, 313-315, 318, 321, 344, 346, 363-364, 382, 388-389, 418-420, 447-448, 458-465, 470-471, 473-477, 511, 513, 523-524, 532, 538-542, 562-566, 568-569, 580, 585-588
1946	654, 717, 723-724
1947	63, 72, 99, 182
1948	141, 144, 16, 169, 184, 192, 199, 205-
1948	141, 144, 163, 169, 184, 192, 199, 205-207, 212, 241-245, 274-275, 278, 290, 314, 356, 365, 371-372, 382-384, 466-467
1949	29, 36

Communism:

1937	382, 385
1947	88
1948	12-13, 27, 29, 45, 48, 70-72, 77-78, 80, 89, 91-93, 97-98, 118, 132-133, 144, 168-170, 178-179, 184, 194-195, 223, 229, 230, 232, 237, 259, 277, 287, 311-312, 321-323, 328-330, 347-348, 351-352, 372, 384-385, 402, 419-420, 469-470, 482-483, 485-487.
1949	11-12, 48

Congress, U. S.:

1935	8, 15, 16, 39, 132, 143, 147, 151, 207, 237, 239, 277, 286, 287
1937	40, 42-43, 46-47, 49-51, 66-69, 85-86, 90-91, 93, 106-110, 112, 115-120, 123-128, 130, 134-139, 143-144, 155-157, 160, 162-163, 165-167, 172-173, 181-183, 200, 202, 204-206, 215-216, 219, 225-228, 230, 237, 241-242, 260, 272-274, 278-280, 284, 293, 387, 388, 401, 404, 412-413, 417, 421, 423-426, 461-462, 483-486, 488-490, 496, 508-509, 514, 527, 531-534, 561-566, 568-570, 580, 582-583, 603-605.
1946	1-5, 15, 18-19, 24, 32-33, 42-44, 272-282, 447, 482
1947	17, 37, 41, 44, 47, 52-53, 57, 101-102, 106-107, 120-121, 155, 185
1948	19, 31-32, 34-36, 67, 90, 98, 101-102, 131, 140-142, 144, 168, 192-194, 200-201, 226-227, 230, 234-235, 237, 241-244, 246, 278-279, 292, 313, 317, 346, 349, 351-352, 364-366, 368, 372, 379, 402, 408, 417.
1949	28, 32, 33, 37

Constitution, United States:

1935	9, 15, 26, 161, 175, 286
1937	47, 50, 57, 60, 74, 80, 108-110, 139, 148, 167, 179-181, 222-223, 231, 240-242, 245, 375, 419, 474, 509.
1946	13-14, 24, 447-448, 469, 498-499, 577, 641
1947	39, 96
1948	118, 141-142, 193, 200, 259, 274, 291, 317, 334-335, 367, 383, 407
1949	11, 28, 292

Debt bonded:

1935	311
1937	43-44, 616
1946	15, 204, 209, 664
1947	123
1949	20

Discrimination against Hawaii:

1935	35-36, 39, 63-64, 94-96, 99-102, 109, 122, 126, 161, 176, 207, 212, 233, 234, 239-243, 302.
1937	135-136, 143-144, 160, 220, 284, 508, 566, 568-569
1946	18-19, 24, 32, 42-44

	Page.
Discrimination against Hawaii—Continued	
1947-----	17, 37, 41, 44, 47, 52-53, 101-102, 106-107, 120-121, 155, 185
1948-----	19,
	31-32, 34-36, 67, 90, 98, 101-102, 131, 140-142, 144, 168, 192-194,
	200-201, 226, 227, 230, 234-235, 237, 241-244, 246, 278-279, 292, 313,
	317, 346, 349, 351-352, 364-366, 368, 372, 379, 402, 408, 417.
1949-----	28, 32, 33, 37
Education:	
1935-----	14,
	33-34, 51, 71, 78, 79, 84, 86, 88, 89, 126, 146, 187-190, 225, 247
1937-----	5,
	29, 32, 35-36, 45-46, 48-50, 62-63, 65, 110, 115, 123-124, 181,
	183-185, 221-222, 233-234, 260-263, 266-269, 275-276, 285-288, 294,
	296, 301-302, 307, 310, 314-315, 319-320, 323-337, 339, 341-346, 355-
	356, 370, 372-377, 417, 437-439, 450-451, 487, 494-495, 497-507, 509-
	510, 545-548, 593-594, 665-666.
1946-----	11,
	25, 39, 45-46, 69-70, 81-82, 94, 174-175, 192-194, 254-255, 258,
	331-332, 334-338, 343-344, 347, 349, 358-359, 361, 375-376, 386-399,
	451-452, 454-457, 465-468, 511, 518-521, 561, 569, 571-572, 584-586,
	588-589, 591-592, 715-719, 739, 832, 873.
1947-----	38, 40-41, 43, 58-60, 77, 93, 97-98, 126, 142, 170
1948-----	9,
	15-18, 53, 62-67, 139-143, 146, 149, 159-160, 166-175, 198-203, 207,
	269-271, 293-297, 339-341, 352-354, 380, 431-435.
1949-----	27, 33-34
Elections:	
1935-----	30,
	43, 46, 47, 54, 55, 56, 72, 73, 90, 97, 119, 127, 155-156, 172, 173, 176,
	177, 179, 181, 182, 193, 197, 200-204, 208, 230, 233, 266-268, 270,
	272, 282, 286, 291, 303, 307.
1937-----	18,
	45-46, 54-55, 72-76, 80, 87, 109, 117, 118, 128-134, 164, 175, 176,
	195-196, 199-200, 210-214, 216-217, 225-226, 282-284, 299-300, 306-
	308, 373-375, 390, 420-422, 477-478, 576, 588-590, 658-660.
1946-----	9,
	17, 27, 29, 46, 178-179, 182-183, 242, 244, 256-257, 330-332, 337, 343,
	346-347, 350, 360, 430-431, 459-460, 471-472, 487-488, 501, 623-624,
	721-725.
1947-----	40, 57, 98, 121
1948-----	44, 80, 91, 106, 175, 185, 190, 202, 217-220, 227-228, 235-236, 240
1949-----	15
Exports:	
1935-----	317
1937-----	28, 35, 141, 627-628, 636
1946-----	9, 695
Federal expenditures and grants:	
1935-----	15, 94-96, 109, 115-117, 149, 168, 234, 290, 312
1937-----	33, 45, 180, 226, 495-496, 501, 507-509, 624
1946-----	75-76, 82-83, 84, 148, 149-150, 315-317, 553, 558, 593-594, 660, 661, 662
1947-----	50, 61
1948-----	194, 336-337
Federal revenues:	
1935-----	28, 99, 301, 317, 326
1937-----	27, 337, 388, 625-626
1946-----	15-16, 187, 189, 287-289, 488-489, 658-659, 676-677, 903
1947-----	16, 39, 50-51, 57, 81, 144, 183, 211-213
1948-----	372
1949-----	15, 29-30
Finances, Territorial:	
1935-----	315
1937-----	25-34, 110, 226, 339-340, 607-624
1946-----	208-209, 211-212, 567-568, 664-667
1947-----	40
1948-----	164-165
1949-----	11

Government, Territorial:

Page.

1936-----	9, 11, 12, 14, 27, 36, 51, 61, 163, 166, 189, 212, 223, 239, 245, 301, 306
1937-----	15-16, 19-21, 24, 90, 120-122, 125-126, 202, 207, 227-228, 236-237
1946-----	12-13, 175-177, 204-205, 207-216, 340, 344, 345, 381, 408, 566-568, 752
1947-----	40-41, 57, 60-61, 98, 101, 104-105, 140-141, 285-287
1948-----	27, 35, 55-59, 94-96, 117-120, 136-137, 164-166, 170, 173, 186-188, 193, 200, 211, 212, 217-220, 226-227, 230, 237-241, 260, 268, 271-272, 355- 357, 364-373, 406-407, 416, 423-425, 445, 464, 494.

1949-----	26, 33
-----------	--------

Health:

1935-----	70, 88, 153-154, 189
1937-----	26, 83, 513-514, 679-684
1946-----	47-51, 69-87, 95-96, 208-209, 560-561, 579, 584, 725, 738, 828-830
1947-----	205-209
1948-----	23, 72-75, 101, 145, 340
1949-----	35

Immigration:

1935-----	25, 26, 114, 117, 124, 138, 161, 241, 243, 253
1937-----	116-118, 144, 150-152, 253-254, 263, 265-266, 310-311, 337, 342, 435-436, 441, 523, 532-535
1946-----	55, 67, 318-320, 483-484, 508, 570, 572-573
1947-----	59, 189
1948-----	100, 242, 244, 278

Imports:

1935-----	317
1937-----	28, 35, 627, 629
1946-----	9, 16, 234-235, 690, 696

Japanese in Hawaii:

1935-----	9, 17-18, 21-24, 27, 29, 31, 34, 36, 40-41, 58, 67-69, 81, 83, 123, 135, 137-138, 160, 179-180, 184-185, 204, 207, 213, 216, 229-232, 237, 239, 245-248, 250, 278, 284.
1937-----	13, 18, 24, 39-42, 44-50, 54-59, 61-70, 146-154, 156, 170-171, 175, 179- 181, 184-185, 187-192, 196-200, 203, 207, 210-217, 221-223, 227, 229-233, 239-272, 276-278, 281-284, 288-297, 302-323, 327-333, 335- 340, 342-353, 357, 360-373, 375-376, 382-383, 388-389, 417-420, 426-488, 513-516, 520-533, 535-548, 572-574, 578-580, 582, 584-590, 593, 634, 654-659.
1946-----	34, 35, 38, 53, 243-246, 248-250, 255-256, 258-259, 262-263, 332, 335-336, 338, 358, 367-368, 375-377, 397-398, 400-403, 430-431, 433, 440, 446, 457-460, 462-465, 471, 473-475, 487-488, 506-511, 530- 536, 543, 568-570, 597-604, 893-894.
1947-----	42-43, 51, 55-56, 63-65, 68-69, 71-72, 74, 157, 180-181, 199-200, 224-229
1948-----	3, 18, 29, 34, 42, 45, 49, 60-61, 64-66, 68, 81, 83, 87-88, 99, 133-136, 142, 151-154, 176-178, 180-181, 196-197, 208, 210, 211, 220-221, 225, 250-252, 262-265, 291, 369-370, 410-416, 427-428, 447, 464-465.

Jones-Costigan Act:

1935-----	35, 38, 54, 64, 85, 96, 113, 122, 176, 214, 230, 239-240, 259
1937-----	269, 277, 485-486, 489, 493, 569
1946-----	18, 19, 32
1947-----	101
1948-----	442

Judiciary:

1935-----	122-123, 140, 144
1937-----	5, 72-73, 86-89, 90, 96-99, 100-101, 123, 124, 126-127, 165, 225-226, 278-279, 286, 358-359, 403, 510-511, 514-515, 569.
1946-----	595-596
1947-----	96
1948-----	46, 56-57, 84, 120-122, 187, 224, 280-283
1949-----	11

	Page.
Labor:	
1935-----	26, 70, 115, 116, 124, 138, 218-221, 250, 257-259, 272, 294
1937-----	12-13,
	16-17, 59, 71-73, 77-86, 94-96, 101-103, 107-108, 116-117, 124,
	168-170, 203, 236-237, 252-253, 305, 353-354, 358-360, 382-383, 422,
	488, 516-517, 633-637, 653-654.
1946-----	17,
	65-66, 102-105, 109-122, 125-126, 128-141, 213-216, 225-226, 284-
	289, 343, 346-347, 368-369, 473-478, 483, 503-504, 565-566, 580-586,
	625-632, 696-701, 696-709, 712-714, 741, 901-902, 908.
1947-----	56-57, 60, 98, 119-120, 142, 185-191, 250-255
1948-----	26-31,
	45-46, 89-90, 145, 147, 169-170, 194-195, 230, 245-248, 273, 292-293,
	330, 341-342, 346-348, 401-410, 420.
1949-----	33, 36
Land:	
1935-----	45, 146, 230, 278-280, 311, 317-318
1937-----	14-16,
	19-22, 31, 53, 120-122, 163, 171-172, 177-179, 208-210, 217, 224, 227,
	379, 390-403, 403-415, 517-519, 601-602, 631-634, 637, 661-664, 693.
1946-----	88-89,
	107, 148-150, 155-158, 160-168, 172-173, 217-222, 228-231, 235-237,
	268-270, 272-282, 336, 370, 373, 441-442, 573-574, 582, 686-687, 745-
	747, 759-762, 770-783.
1947-----	16,
	25-27, 45, 58, 62, 79, 82-85, 107-117, 122-134, 143-148, 153, 158-160,
	223, 229-245, 257-284, 293-310.
1948-----	11-12,
	43-44, 139-140, 272-273, 331-337, 387-388, 399, 422-423, 447-448
1949-----	15-16
Law enforcement:	
1935-----	51, 117, 122, 156
1937-----	72-73,
	87-89, 91, 96-99, 101-102, 125-126, 165, 211-212, 237, 358-359, 374-
	375, 511, 514, 542-543, 546-548.
1946-----	17, 25, 594-597, 835-837, 841-873, 903, 904, 906
1947-----	29, 51, 103, 107
1948-----	8, 33-34, 51-52, 103-104, 106-110, 115, 130, 463-466
Literacy:	
1935-----	313
1937-----	59
1946-----	332, 337-338, 739
1947-----	33, 55, 246, 247
1948-----	189
1949-----	69, 72
Loyalty to United States:	
1935-----	11,
	16, 18, 23-24, 30, 34, 37, 41, 63, 72, 78, 80, 91-92, 98, 107, 115, 118,
	126, 134, 136, 139, 150, 153, 160, 169, 173, 174, 184, 186, 187, 190, 199,
	200, 204, 205, 207, 211, 213, 214, 216, 220, 221, 225, 226, 227, 229-
	233, 236, 237, 244, 247, 248, 253, 254, 258, 276, 283, 288, 290.
1937-----	46-48,
	50, 56-57, 68-70, 105-106, 114-115, 148-152, 167, 170, 183, 191, 196-
	198, 219, 223, 231-232, 239-242, 271-272, 280-281, 283, 292-296,
	303-305, 313-314, 322-323, 327-328, 332, 339, 348, 350, 352, 363, 376,
	383-384, 388-389, 419, 464-465, 475, 484-485, 512-514, 524-525,
	539-540, 544-545, 573, 579, 585-586, 588.
1946-----	38,
	53, 255-256, 262-263, 397-398, 400-403, 433, 440, 446, 457-460, 462-
	465, 473-475, 506-507, 509-510, 536, 569, 572-573.
1947-----	40,
	41, 63, 66-67, 72, 99, 155-156, 163, 171-172, 178-181, 224-229
1948-----	11,
	183, 203, 251, 258, 380, 410-416, 473-475, 484-485
1949-----	26, 32, 47

	Page
Military government :	
1946	33, 466
1947	21-22, 66, 156
1948	34-35, 103, 118, 127-128, 282-283, 382
National defense :	
1935	11,
	12, 16, 39, 53, 63, 98, 104, 123, 133, 184, 199, 214, 250, 259, 260, 289-290, 304.
1937	173-174,
	220, 232, 280, 483-484, 512-513, 520, 528, 577-579, 584-585, 588
1946	40-41
1947	44, 48-50, 53-54, 56, 61-77, 80, 87, 122, 144
1948	13-14, 492
1949	11
Newlands resolution :	
1937	381-382, 387
1946	13
1947	37, 42, 96, 103
1949	53
Newspapers :	
1935	18, 122, 177, 180, 263, 283, 314
1937	12-13,
	15, 17-21, 36-37, 39, 59-60, 73-74, 92, 98, 102-103, 167, 249-251, 254-255, 257-259, 272-279, 283, 289, 294, 296, 342, 358, 385-386, 415, 423, 450-452, 457-465, 482, 527-528, 540, 570, 573-574, 586-588, 604, 639, 649-652.
1946	44-45, 472-473, 740, 826, 889, 891-892, 893
1948	495
Organic act :	
1935	12, 14, 21, 53, 57, 63, 93-96, 98, 148, 184, 242, 272
1937	67-68,
	108, 112, 118, 125-130, 135, 139-140, 160-164, 173-174, 183, 209-210, 214-215, 234, 278, 356, 358, 388, 394, 398, 401-404, 408-409, 412-413, 420, 484, 564-565, 584.
1946	13, 31, 242-243, 269-283, 350-
	352, 367, 373, 408, 411-412, 447-448, 489-490, 748-752, 824-825
1947	37, 132, 134, 137
1948	99, 122
1949	56
Pacific era :	
1946	37-40, 388-389
1947	40, 76-80, 86, 89, 139
1948	142,
	166, 168, 174-175, 231-232, 248-249, 261, 267-268, 293-294, 473, 493
1949	11, 34, 38
Pineapple industry :	
1935	212, 217, 219, 315
1937	35,
	59, 169, 177-178, 193-194, 208, 210, 235-236, 305, 376, 378-381, 389-390, 398, 403, 414, 495, 631-633, 636-637.
1946	90-91, 93-94,
	101-107, 221-222, 232-233, 324, 561-563, 685-686, 705-706, 901-902
1947	24-25, 183
1948	143-147, 157-158, 297-310, 332-335, 337-338
Plebiscite :	
1935	16, 25, 34, 93
1937	49, 137-138, 166, 228, 277, 283, 305, 512, 579-580, 585
1946	4-5, 12, 15, 24, 133, 139, 282, 284, 290-
	291, 293, 305, 338, 361-362, 366-369, 372-374, 447, 475, 491-498, 725
1947	38, 71
1948	162, 254, 421
1949	27, 38
Political parties :	
1935	57-59, 70, 87, 119, 127, 189, 191-192, 195, 291
1937	40, 54, 72-74, 76, 80-81, 86-87, 105-107, 118, 127-129,
	131, 134, 155-156, 158-159, 182, 195, 199, 215, 239, 311, 359, 511

	Page
Political parties—Continued	
1946-----	28-29, 30-31, 224-225,
350, 431-432, 440-441, 452, 459, 466-467, 722-723, 736, 896-897	
1947-----	40, 136-137, 151
1948-----	197, 227, 247, 273-274, 275-276, 283-289, 323-324, 370, 383, 385, 424
1949-----	29
Polls on statehood:	
1946-----	15, 887
1947-----	139
1948-----	1, 41, 123, 148-149, 162, 198, 420-421, 438, 446-447
1949-----	27
Population:	
1935-----	7, 9, 10,
18, 23, 37-38, 40, 59, 103, 118-120, 126, 190, 228, 293-294, 296-297	
1937-----	45, 105-109,
113, 115, 175, 184-185, 247-250, 253, 264, 280, 298-300, 302, 374,	
420-421, 426, 428-431, 434, 439-445, 467-469, 589-590, 654-655	
1946-----	15, 31, 41-42, 55-61, 67-68, 70, 485-487, 507-
508, 561, 568-570, 572-573, 593, 601-603, 654-655, 717-718, 723	
1947-----	39, 40-42, 54, 59, 71, 102, 163-164
1948-----	96-97, 258-259, 493
1949-----	12-13, 35, 47
Property, assessed valuation of:	
1935-----	311
1937-----	43-44, 630
1946-----	190-192, 195-202, 668
1947-----	39, 104
1948-----	356-357, 446
Public utilities:	
1937-----	52, 73, 134-135, 156, 157,
164-165, 168-169, 176, 206-207, 234-236, 278-279, 577, 645-648	
1946-----	224-225, 563, 575-576, 680-682, 825
1947-----	192, 199
Public welfare:	
1935-----	316
1937-----	494-498, 513-514, 576-577, 678-684
1946-----	560-561, 582, 593-594, 725-727, 834-835
1947-----	57, 105, 199, 205-206, 209, 247
Public works:	
1935-----	311-312, 316
1937-----	5, 29, 33, 43, 138, 143, 156, 217, 695
1946-----	148-154, 582
Race:	
1935-----	7, 9,
11, 16, 18, 20, 24, 25, 29, 36, 37, 40, 42, 50-51, 53, 71, 86, 90, 97, 98, 113,	
115, 117-119, 121, 127, 131, 142, 149, 153-154, 173-175, 178-179, 182,	
200, 204, 212, 214, 226, 230, 233, 239, 248, 250, 293, 295-296.	
1937-----	44-45,
54, 62-63, 132, 135, 167-168, 184-185, 211-212, 275-276, 356, 374,	
428-431, 548, 570-572, 654, 658-660.	
1946-----	25-26,
29-30, 34-36, 56-68, 134-135, 137-138, 212, 222, 243-244, 255-256,	
263, 285-286, 295, 311, 336-338, 340, 358, 367-368, 373, 375-377,	
403-405, 415, 419-420, 430-433, 440-442, 444, 448-449, 457-458,	
473-477, 484-485, 522, 599-606, 875-881. •	
1947-----	40, 42, 55, 58, 80, 99, 102-103, 162
1948-----	17-18,
22, 47-51, 65-66, 79, 82, 85-86, 88-89, 138, 142, 145-146, 149, 154-157,	
169, 172, 174, 183, 191-192, 201-208, 239-240, 249, 256-257, 286, 325,	
359, 361-363, 379-380, 403, 446, 479-482, 495.	
1949-----	11, 28-29, 32-33
Shipping:	
1935-----	317
1937-----	28, 35, 43-44, 52, 73, 77, 164-165, 168-169, 204-206, 236, 360, 627-629, 636
1946-----	153-155, 223-224, 422, 609-621, 680, 682, 694-695
1947-----	39

Social Security:	Page
1935-----	220
1937-----	236, 496-497, 501
1946-----	594, 725-727, 834
1947-----	33, 59
1949-----	69
Sugar Industry:	
1935-----	35, 38-39, 54, 96, 164, 176, 259, 304, 315, 318
1937-----	40, 51, 53, 74, 82-83, 136-137, 139-141, 170, 235-236, 422, 494, 517, 575-576, 633, 639.
1946-----	32, 90-110, 218-219, 222, 233, 341-343, 347-348, 358-359, 391-392, 474-475, 563-564, 610-611, 683-685, 705, 622-824.
1947-----	17, 22-24, 44-47, 52, 117, 182-195
1948-----	19-24, 386-399, 423-425, 439-443
Taxation:	
1935-----	9-11, 36, 38, 52, 95, 98-99, 113, 222, 305
1937-----	25, 27, 30-33, 225-226, 234-235, 621, 630, 666
1946-----	183-184, 208, 211-212, 665-667
1947-----	152, 156
1948-----	34-35, 67, 103, 140-142, 144, 244, 305, 346, 372, 381, 446
1949-----	28, 33
Unions:	
1935-----	70-71
1937-----	72-73, 95, 100-103, 105, 168, 360, 545.
1946-----	131-138, 284, 368-369, 476-477, 565-566, 362, 709
1947-----	33, 36, 57, 60, 89-90, 199, 252-254.
1948-----	27-30, 70, 89-90, 230, 247, 341, 346-348, 401, 403-405, 460, 483
Veterans:	
1935-----	33, 186
1937-----	23-25, 39
1946-----	213, 244-243, 276-284, 512, 623
1948-----	1-6-127, 133-135, 224-226.
War record:	
1935-----	107-108, 118, 185-186.
1937-----	58, 114, 183, 470, 520, 524-525, 545, 584
1946-----	9, 11-12, 18-19, 25-26, 33-36, 38, 41-42, 47-55, 71-72, 130, 138, 209-210, 358, 372-373, 375-376, 398, 400-403, 407, 433, 446, 449-450, 457-458, 463, 470, 494-495, 560-564, 597-599, 633-635, 727-728, 736-738, 832-833, 837-840.
1947-----	74-75, 99, 105-106, 173-179, 224-229
1948-----	8, 133-135, 142, 151-154, 156, 183, 250, 257-258, 263, 291, 324-325, 354- 355, 427-428, 446, 465, 473.
1949-----	11

Secretary CHAPMAN. I think that should be most helpful and will provide vital information on any subject pertinent to this question.

I believe you have the facts before you, gentlemen. I do not believe there are any more facts that need to be presented here. I think you have them, and if I did not think so, I would be searching and try to get them before you either in written form or orally. The things that continue to stand out in my mind are the fact that the Constitution of the United States was extended to Hawaii, the fact that Hawaii has been taxed without representation, the fact that it is one of the greatest melting pots of America, a mixture of races of people, a great mixture.

Are we going to ask Hawaii to apologize today for her mixture of races? Then if you do, what are you going to say to New York? Are we going back to that kind of a principle today? Of course not.

You are going to decide it on fundamental issues that are before you such as Senator Malone has raised, which is a perfectly legitimate one, and one that Senator Butler has raised about which he is con-

cerned. I do not blame him for being concerned about that problem, but it appears to me that even if everything you said was correct, Senator, it still would not control the political destiny of Hawaii, because the Republicans would still win the Senatorships of Hawaii and the Governorship of Hawaii. Generally in their philosophy the people of Hawaii are Republican. I believe that, but I am for their rights being protected.

That is the paramount thing here, their civil rights, their right to vote for their Senators and Congressmen, their right to vote for their President, and that to me stands out stronger than all the other questions combined.

I will compromise on most anything in this bill except my fundamental principle, to help make this bill a workable bill. I want it to work. I want Hawaii to be a State accepted on an equal basis with other States.

The obligations of the Federal Government should be carried out. Why should we let the incident of one political party's convention disrupt and stop us completely in our deliberations here, other than to get at the truth of what happened.

I want to get that for you. I think you should have that, but I do not think it should stop the deliberation and the fair consideration of this question before you of admitting Hawaii today as a State of the Union.

Never before have I appeared before this committee or any other committee with a more earnest request than that you admit this area as a State among our States of the Union.

Senator ANDERSON. I do believe, if you have concluded, that we would like to have an opportunity to go to the Senate floor for a few moments.

Secretary CHAPMAN. If another day would win his vote, I would cancel any other business.

Senator ANDERSON. We will resume at 2:30.

(Whereupon, at 12:50 p. m., the hearing recessed to reconvene at 2:30 p. m. this same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, chairman, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Houston.

STATEMENT OF VICTOR K. S. HOUSTON, CHAIRMAN, HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION—Resumed

Mr. HOUSTON. I started this morning, Mr. Chairman, and would like to continue on the constitutionality of the Hawaiian Homes Act.

I read to the committee this morning the report of the House committee, with a paragraph from the House of Representatives committee report on the Territories with respect to the constitutionality, in which it said, in principal:

The privileges of the immunity clause of the Constitution and due process and equal protection clauses of the fourteenth amendment thereto are prohibitions having reference to State action only, but even without this defense the legislation is based upon a reasonable and not arbitrary classification and is therefore not unconstitutional class legislation.

I have here, Mr. Chairman, a copy of the opinion of the then Harry Irwin, who was the attorney general of Hawaii, of which I will read only the most pertinent part of the opinion.

He said:

I come now to the proposition which I believe to be one which merits the consideration of the committee and which I believe constitutes a sound and the only basis upon which legislation of this kind can be enacted.

The proposition, briefly stated, is that the Federal Government, in the exercise of its plenary powers over the Territory of Hawaii, should by appropriate legislation set apart for the exclusive use of members of the Hawaiian race certain portions of the public domain of Hawaii for the purpose of rehabilitating the race, and preventing its ultimate extinction.

It has been suggested by some, and emphatically stated by others, that legislation of this kind may not be constitutionally enacted for the reason as suggested, that it would be class legislation, and therefore in violation of the Constitution of the United States.

No parallel of the Constitution has been suggested as being prohibitive of this legislation, nor do I know of any such prohibitive provision in the Constitution.

That is the attorney general of Hawaii, at the time the bill was originally passed.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you at the beginning of your statement this morning summarize the Hawaiian Home Commissions Act?

Mr. HOUSTON. In general terms, yes, Mr. Chairman. It is an act in which certain of the remaining public lands of the Territory were set aside to the use of rehabilitating Hawaiians, and providing that the lands might be awarded to homesteaders upon a 99-year lease who qualified by blood, 50 percent or more being required, and that there were town-site or house-lot projects, agricultural projects which extended from 1 to 40 acres, grazing projects which ran in first-class grazing land from 100 to 250, and second-class grazing land from 250 to 1,000 acres.

The provisions with respect to the 99-year lease rather than the fee-simple title was for the purpose of preventing or of repeating what had happened originally when the lands were distributed to the Hawaiian people between 1840 and 1949.

When it was found that the Hawaiian, not being used to fee-simple titles, never having heard that term used before and having lived under a semif feudal condition, soon got rid of it by being offered money for it, and then he had the money which he spent and he had no more land.

That in a few words, Mr. Chairman, is the purpose of the Hawaiian Homes Act. I stated at that time that since its origin in 1920 there had been placed on the land about 1,337 homesteaders, aggregating a population of about 7,000 inhabitants, with 3,000 minor children remaining on the land.

The CHAIRMAN. When this bill came over from the House, and I read it for consideration by this committee, I took note of the fact that the provision contained in the bill at page 9 is to the effect that the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act may not be altered or repealed without the consent of the United States, which would mean, of course, without the enactment of a special statute by Congress and signed by the President.

That raised in my mind immediately a question as to why it seemed desirable to tie the hands of the new State authorities if the statehood should be granted, with respect to this particular act.

I suppose you will discuss that question?

Mr. HOUSTON. The only explanation that I can give of that is that that is the form of the legislation which was requested by the legislature of 1947, which was passed in the House of Representatives as being satisfactory at that time, no opposition having been offered.

It was again passed upon in the Territorial Legislature of 1949 without any changes being suggested for the enabling act, and has again been passed in the House of Representatives in that same form.

I assume that that is placed in there because the original legislation is legislation that the Federal Government alone could make. A State government could not set aside apparently—according to the decisions of the courts—land for such particular purposes.

Since the terms of lease are for 99 years—and there are still some seventy-odd years perhaps or so to run—it seems reasonable that it should be put in that particular form.

The CHAIRMAN. Why could not a State properly constituted enact legislation of this kind?

Mr. HOUSTON. Being a layman, Mr. Chairman, and not a lawyer, I am not in a position to answer that.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any opinion with respect to the problem?

Mr. HOUSTON. The only opinion is the part that I read to you from the opinion of the Attorney General of the Territory, in which he said—

The CHAIRMAN. I am not trying to get a legal discussion. I am trying to determine the basic reasons for denying to the people of Hawaii and the new State the authority to amend and change a law dealing with the matter of homesteads upon certain lands.

Mr. HOUSTON. The only reason that I can advance, Mr. Chairman, is that there should be no change in the policy, but that there should be a continuation of it, in other words, the Legislature of Hawaii wishes to prevent alienation of the holdings.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a controversy of some kind about this, of course.

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; which has only developed recently. I have not seen the brief to be submitted by Senator Nobriga.

The CHAIRMAN. This committee has received more than 50 telegrams.

Mr. HOUSTON. All coming from the same source.

The CHAIRMAN. All raising this issue. I am trying to find out what the center of the controversy is.

Mr. HOUSTON. As I said, that form of the legislation was initiated in the Legislature of Hawaii, so that it got complete publicity. It was then passed by the House of Representatives of the United States Congress after hearings before the committee, when publicity was again given to the subject.

Then it was available for discussion in the Territorial legislature of 1949, with consequent publicity, and no suggested change was made.

In between those times there was a general election in which no changes were suggested by any of the candidates, and a general election for the constitutional convention at which no successful candidates—successful candidates, I say—advanced that argument for change.

The CHAIRMAN. Forgetting that, let us ask now how the act has been administered. Has it served the purposes for which it was enacted?

Mr. HOUSTON. Starting from scratch, with no population, and having to depend upon legislation by the Territorial legislature to provide administrative funds, it has gone along what I consider very successfully. We have now 1,300 homesteaders.

The CHAIRMAN. How many acres?

Mr. HOUSTON. The total land involved is about 180,000 acres, of which 105,000, in round figures, still remains unoccupied or unallotted. The balance is land that is being leased.

The CHAIRMAN. For a period of how many years?

Mr. HOUSTON. Since 1920.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Cordon?

Senator CORDON. Of the remaining land subject to the act, what portion is arable or tillable?

Mr. HOUSTON. Practically none. The remaining portion is grazing land, mostly.

Senator CORDON. Correct me if I am wrong. It seems to me that I recall—I am not certain whether it was on Molokai or not—on one of the islands having my attention called to certain areas, then under lease and in cultivation, growing pineapples or sugarcane, one or the other—

Mr. HOUSTON. The Island of Molokai, I think.

Senator CORDON (continuing). Which I was given to understand were owned as public land and where there was some question as to whether they should be withdrawn from use in agriculture and divided under the terms of this Hawaiian Homes Act.

Mr. HOUSTON. In the Territorial legislature of 1947 a bill was enacted requesting Congress to add to the then existing Hawaiian homelands an area at Molokai on the eastern side of Kaunakakai. That area was then, and is still, under an existing lease, which does not expire for some time.

That was approved—the addition was approved by the United States Congress, and those lands now form part of the Hawaiian Homes Commission land. But since the lease has not yet expired, the appropriation which was made in anticipation of its becoming available, is standing to our credit.

Senator CORDON. Then your answer to my first question is “Yes” rather than “No,” that there are lands that are cultivatable, now being cultivated, now under lease, which either are or will become subject to disposition under this act?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes. I was not thinking of the lands that had been added to the original lands, because that was done recently.

Senator CORDON. How many acres are in this last status?

Mr. HOUSTON. I cannot say offhand. I think there were about 250 acres, possibly. It is a comparatively small tract. It was to be for house lots.

Senator CORDON. How many acres of government land—I assume originally termed Crown land—are now under lease for agricultural purposes but not included within the described areas that are subject to the Hawaiian Homestead Act?

Mr. HOUSTON. I cannot give you that information.

Senator CORDON. It is a considerable amount?

Mr. HOUSTON. About 25,000 or 28,000 acres, I should say, at a rough guess.

Senator CORDON. That is what I wanted, Mr. Chairman. That is all that I have.

Mr. HOUSTON. Shall I continue?

The CHAIRMAN. If you please.

Mr. HOUSTON. An opinion in 1922 was also rendered by the Solicitor of the Interior Department, which bears upon the question of constitutionality, and he, in answer to a question by the chairman of the Committee on Territories in the House of Representatives, who asked:

Would an act of Congress setting apart a limited area of the public lands of the Territory of Hawaii for lease or occupation by native Hawaiians be unconstitutional.

And he answered:

It would not. There are numerous congressional precedents for such action. The act of Congress approved February 8, 1887, as amended by the act of February 28, 1891 (26 Stat. 794), authorizes public lands which have been set apart as Indian reservations by order of the President to be surveyed and 80 acres of land therein to be allotted to each Indian located upon the reservation, or where the lands are valuable for grazing, to be allotted in areas of 160 acres. Another section of the same act authorizes any Indians entitled to allotment to make settlement upon any public lands of the United States, not otherwise appropriated, and to have same allotted to them.

Resolution No. 20, passed by the House of Representatives December 10, 1919, and by the Senate February 5, 1920, gives to soldiers of the late war a preference right over all other citizens to enter public lands of the United States when same shall be open to disposition. H. R. 11553 proposes to set apart a large area of valuable public lands in Imperial Valley, Calif., for disposition to soldiers. Many instances might be cited where Congress has conferred special privileges or advantages upon classes of individuals in connection with the disposition or use of public land. Another line of acts of Congress are the numerous laws setting apart areas of public lands for water supply or park purposes of cities, counties, and towns.

Mr. HOUSTON. During the hearings before the Committee on Territories there were some other questions on the constitutionality that perhaps I might quote to you. There is a statement by the chairman of the committee at that time. One of the witnesses who at that time opposed the passage of the act—and may I say that the witness at that time, who opposed the passage of the act, was the paid representative of the largest ranch in the Territory, the so-called Parker Ranch.

The chairman made this statement: "We enact laws for reclamation and irrigation projects. We give preference to certain people to go onto those projects. We open up certain tracts of land and people go in and draw lots for those. It has been the established policy of the Government to settle land in that manner. Also by homestead and by preemption. And if there is any class legislation in it, why it is an established policy of the Government that has been enacted into legislation time after time and has been held to be constitutional by the courts time and again."

Senator BUTLER. The Parker Ranch is still the largest ranch?

Mr. HOUSTON. It is still the largest single ranch.

Senator BUTLER. It is largely leased land or deeded land?

Mr. HOUSTON. They lease a large part of government land, but they also have a lot of land in fee simple.

Mr. Chairman, finally, because it bears upon the passage of this interesting piece of legislation, I would like to offer for your records

an excerpt from the House Congressional Record of May 21, 1920, in which the then Delegate, Prince Kalanianaʻole, made his statement with respect to what he hoped to do with this project.

It is very interesting, but somewhat repetitious because you have heard many of the arguments used.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be received.

The excerpt from House Congressional Record, May 21, 1920, is as follows:

The Hawaiian race is passing. And if conditions continue to exist as they do today, this splendid race of people, my people, will pass from the face of the earth. At the time of the discovery, in 1778, Captain Cook estimated the population at 400,000, which he probably overestimated. Two hundred and fifty thousand would be about the correct number. The official census taken in 1832, 54 years later, revealed the fact that there were 130,319 Hawaiians, and today only 20,000 pure Hawaiians are left and an equal number of part Hawaiians.

The legislation proposed seeks to place the Hawaiian back on the soil, so that the valuable and sturdy traits of that race, peculiarly adapted to the islands, shall be preserved to posterity.

I think a situation is presented here that can be distinguished from any other. Perhaps we have a legal right, certainly we have a moral right, to ask that these lands be set aside. We are not asking that what you are to do be in the nature of a largesse or as a grant, but as a matter of justice—belated justice—and extend a least a helping hand, without cost to the Government of the United States, to the Hawaiians in their endeavor to rehabilitate themselves, a people who are thoroughly loyal to the Government of the United States.

It is a subject in comparison with which all others sink into insignificance, for our first and great duty is that of self-preservation. Our acts are in vain unless you can stay the wasting hand that is destroying my people. I feel a heavy and special responsibility resting upon me in this matter, but it is one in which you all must share; nor shall we be acquitted by man or our Maker of a neglect of duty if we fail to act speedily and effectually in the cause of my people.

Mr. HOUSTON. The Hawaiian Homes Commission project is primarily, as I indicated, not an economic measure, nor one to increase the financial expectations of the homesteaders. It is purely and simply what the Prince had wanted: a rehabilitation project, so that the race which had been so terrifically decimated could be brought back to more normal numbers.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand you to say that there are about 1,200 homesteaders on this area.

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they actually living on the land?

Mr. HOUSTON. All living on the land; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they utilizing the land as individuals in their own right?

Mr. HOUSTON. They are utilizing the land. Some of it is through contract, because of the pineapple development which requires the utilization of large areas in Hawaii, because of climatic conditions.

The producers enter into a contract through the Homes Commission with the individual lessees, and the lessees are in turn able to seek employment from them, so that they get a fee for their land, and wages for their services besides.

The CHAIRMAN. Does it boil down, then, to this: that a substantial part of this area, while in the name of individuals as their individual property, is in fact being managed for agricultural purposes not by the titleholder but by some lessee?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is true with respect to the pineapple producing lots.

The CHAIRMAN. How about sugar?

Mr. HOUSTON. There is no sugar there.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a difference which we note in this country between individual small family farms and corporate farms; is that the distinction there?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the heart of the controversy?

Mr. HOUSTON. I do not believe so, sir. The controversy, as I understand it, has relation to some of the lands on the big island of Hawaii in the neighborhood of the Parker ranch which lands are now leased to the Parker Ranch, the lease having expired and the homes commission being desirous to set up a Hawaiian homes project on those lands.

I may say with respect to those lands, that we could not utilize them until the lease had expired. We could not utilize the lands until water became available. The water was under lease also, Mr. Chairman, and that lease expired in 1947.

The Territorial Legislature of 1947, mind you, with respect to this parcel, passed an act providing \$350,000 to open up that area for Hawaiian Homes Commission work.

The CHAIRMAN. The question that is suggested to my mind, and one which I would like to have completely explored, is whether or not the desire to insert this limitation upon the freedom on the legislature of the new State was designed, either directly or indirectly, or remotely, to prevent a change of this leasehold system which you have described.

Mr. HOUSTON. I could not say as to what the purposes were, because I had nothing to do with that originally, sir. I have only become chairman of the Commission this last year.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you see any objection to striking that out of this bill so that the people of Hawaii, through their legislature, would be perfectly free to handle this question as they would any other question involving—

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes, I would.

The CHAIRMAN. Give us those reasons, please.

Mr. HOUSTON. Because of the possibility of changing a project which has been running for, now, some years, and which has shown successful results to change anything having to do with the Hawaiian population, that way would be disastrous.

I have heard many Hawaiians express themselves to the effect that if the Hawaiian Homes Commission projects are not protected that they would rather stay a Territory in which case they would remain as is, of course. I have always said to them "No, you should not take such a position." The experience of past years has shown that when fee-simple titles were given, Hawaiians were tempted to dispose of their holdings, and it is my feeling that they should be protected against this action for at least the 99-year period.

The CHAIRMAN. Why would it be disastrous? I am trying to get the facts here, not opinions.

Mr. HOUSTON. Because of the possibility that you suggest, that they might change it.

The CHAIRMAN. What would be disastrous about a change?

Mr. HOUSTON. The Hawaiian, on the Homes Commission, has the benefit of a revolving fund for construction purposes. He has a certain security there in the form in which it has so far successfully gone. They have gone up against so many vicious changes in their short life of 150 years since the islands discovery. The population as I said and as Mr. King told you was reduced from 350,000 by 50,000 each 10-year period, until in 1823 it had been reduced to a half. It just went down by 10,000 every 10 years.

The low point was reached in 1900, after annexation, when there were only 37,600 Hawaiians and Part-Hawaiians left. Now there are 85,000 Hawaiians, more than double, Mr. Chairman. Is that not a good reason why we Hawaiians do not feel that we would like to have a change made in that, and would prefer to have it remain as is?

The CHAIRMAN. Is it your feeling that this act has served to stem the decline of Hawaiian population?

Mr. HOUSTON. I cannot go that far. But I say that probably, psychologically, it has had some influence, and that it is one of the large factors stemming the decrease of the population, yes. I will go that far.

The CHAIRMAN. And you feel that if it were repealed or changed, then the decline might appear again?

Mr. HOUSTON. I am somewhat afraid of it.

The CHAIRMAN. If you could give us the reasons for so feeling, I think it would be helpful.

Mr. HOUSTON. I could not advance that. That would have to be based upon factors based on the future.

The CHAIRMAN. It is your conclusion?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes, sir.

Senator CORDON. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Cordon.

Senator CORDON. I seem to get out of this discussion a feeling that you are taking this position: That the Territory of Hawaii is politically mature. It is fully competent to undertake all of the responsibilities of statehood, but not this one.

Mr. HOUSTON. The difficulty arises by reason of the comparative maturity between the Hawaiian group and the others, and further as shown by the legal opinions quoted, that the setting up of such a project is one that could only be done by the Federal Government, and that it could not be done by a State government. And probably there might be—and I do not know as to that—it could not be conducted by a State government without the Federal participation. Such a question might be brought up. Whereas it can be authorized as a compact, in the language of the bill, as I understand it, between the Federal Government and the new State Government, the title to the lands remaining in the Federal Government, if you please, and the administration remaining as indicated.

Senator CORDON. Of course your lack of logic—if there is a little bit there—isn't too material. I seem to recall that most of the acts for admission of States, where there were land grants, very frequently were tied to the grant by the United States a requirement that it be used for certain purposes, whether the State wanted it leased for that purpose or not. So you are not entirely without precedent.

Mr. HOUSTON. I apologize for not being a lawyer. I would like to have been one.

The CHAIRMAN. There are not very many witnesses who come to committees of Congress making apologies on that ground, sir.

Senator BUTLER. You have my sympathy, Mr. Houston.

Mr. HOUSTON. I am doing the best I can, sir. Do you wish me to continue?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. HOUSTON. I know you are pressed for time, and other people would like to be heard.

The administration of the Hawaiian homes project is financed very generally by the legislature. We receive from the "available" lands—those are lands that are set aside and not used—certain rentals. Where our administrative costs at the present time run around \$350,000, plus or minus, the rentals run to about not to exceed \$150,000. So the difference is made up by the legislature and has been consistently made up.

There is a loan fund which is a revolving fund, naturally, from which loans have been made to the homesteaders for the building of their homes. It is a very modest one.

Senator CORDON. What is the source of the loan fund?

Mr. HOUSTON. The source of the fund came from the rental of sugar lands and from the licensing of water rights, until it had been built up.

I have already touched on the question of the project which is the land in which Mr. Nobriga has indicated some interest.

I might only indicate that since the appropriation for the Hawaiian Homes development in this area has been made, and in anticipation of the termination of the lease, we have let a contract to bring the water down from where it is now, down to the area so that it can be developed for homestead purposes.

That is about all that I have to say, Mr. Chairman. I am ready to answer any further questions that you have.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

I remember, Mr. Houston, that the joint committee which went to Hawaii in 1937 received a great deal of testimony on this subject. Unfortunately, I have not had a chance to go over that testimony since the beginning of these hearings. But my recollection is that there was a substantial controversy at that time. Perhaps the thing for us to do now would be to hear Mr. Nobriga. Then perhaps the general outline of the controversy in its present status will be clear to us.

Mr. HOUSTON. I may add this now, perhaps as a further explanation: When the Hawaiian Homes Act was originally set up in 1920, the lands that remained in government control then were just the remnants, because provision was made in the bill that sugar lands were excepted.

Mind you, in certain areas beach lands were excepted. That was the normal place of habitation for the Hawaiians. They were excepted. All sugar lands were excepted, and of course military reservations and forest reserves. As to Senator Nobriga's claims, it may be pertinent to say that he ran for the constitution convention and was defeated when he ran in east Hawaii, one of seven candidates at large. The successful candidate, Tom T. Okino, had 6,159 votes against 1,994 for Nobriga, who ran fifth.

(The following letter was subsequently submitted for the record by Mr. Houston:)

MAY 5, 1950.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: In accordance with the permission you granted me this date at the Hawaii statehood hearings to extend my remarks following Senator Nobriga's testimony relating to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, I submit herewith the following:

1. The inclusion in H. R. 49 of section 3, subsection sixth, page 9, regarding the compact to be entered into by the State of Hawaii re the Hawaiian Homes Commission, was initiated not by the Hawaiian Homes Commission, but, by a committee of the official statehood commission, of which the late Judge A. G. M. Robertson was a member, in 1946.

It is interesting to note that Judge Robertson was the counsel for the Parker Ranch, who opposed the original Hawaiian Homes Act.

This committee made its report to the Territorial legislature of 1947, and it was inserted in the draft of the enabling act. As Chairman of the present Hawaiian Homes Commission, I was not at that time aware of the legislative action until it came out. But I am sensitive of the great need of its being included in the enabling act, in order to assure the continuation of the project throughout the life of the original leases—99 years—the first of which will not expire till 2021 or thereabout.

2. Senator Nobriga states in his brief in his third paragraph that the compact is without precedent in the admission of any of the present States into the Union. That may very well be, but the fact remains that the Federal Government has looked after the Indians in continental reservations, the Eskimos in Alaska, the Chamorros in Guam, the Samoans in American Samoa, and the Filipinos in the Philippines, when they were under our care. Only in Hawaii the native race has never been taken care of by the Federal Government. None of the expenses with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Commission are paid for by the Federal Government.

The compact feature may also be compared to the water schemes or compacts in the Southwestern States which ratify agreements between certain States and the United States Government, before the Federal Government undertook to construct reclamation works.

There is nothing in the acceptance of this provision in the enabling act, H. R. 49, that is in opposition to the argument that the Territory is in all respects ready to assume the responsibilities of statehood any more than you could argue that California or Arizona were giving up any of their sovereign rights in signing the water-control compacts which they did.

3. With respect to the statistics used by Senator Nobriga regarding the Hawaiian Homes Commission projects (1,119 homesteads, 5,373 persons), more recent figures, December 31, 1949, show 1,337 homesteads and 6,517 persons.

4. Senator Nobriga stated that homestead leases "are situated on the 8,000 most arid, most rocky, most unproductive acres among the 169,000 reserved to the Hawaiian Homes Commission." This statement is a complete distortion of the picture. To be sure, some may be described as "arid," since the water supply is small, but the soil is so rich, that most of these lands have been and are used to produce some of the best pineapples being raised in the islands. These specific lands were designated in the original bill as being the areas first to be settled, because of their ability to produce a money crop immediately.

Other homesteads are in an area which is rocky, to be sure, but the leases in this instance are for house lots only. These lots are near the city of Hilo, and the lessees find ready employment, and have been amongst the happiest under the cognizance of the Commission.

5. The remarks regarding the "painful spectacle of a fat bureaucracy" may be refuted as follows:

The staff of the Hawaiian Homes Commission is comprised of Territorial civil-service personnel, headed by an executive secretary, and there is neither deceit nor betrayal in its administration.

6. Senator Nobriga at the present time holds a lease from the Territorial lands commissioner of some 200-odd acres of land that the Hawaiian Homes Commission has returned to the commissioner for leasing, since no funds for the development has been provided to date by the legislature. I am advised that Senator Nobriga holds a half interest in a parcel of 6,000-odd acres abutting Hawaiian Homes Commission grazing lands on the island of Hawaii.

The Senator for the last year has been trying to get the Hawaiian Homes Commission to agree to a subdivision of some of these abutting lands, so that he and some of those whom he undertook to represent might bid on them.

The legislature of 1947 had provided an appropriation of \$350,000 looking to the development of this area by the Hawaiian Homes Commission. The commission was held up in proceeding with this project because the Governor of the Territory had proposed a Federal reclamation project in this area. However, the legislature of 1949 rejected this Federal project because it alienated some of the Hawaiian homes lands. Currently, the Hawaiian Homes Commission has gone ahead with its plan for opening the tract in which Senator Nobriga has an interest. A contract has been let, and is awaiting acquisition of rights of way for irrigation lines.

As bearing upon the rejection of the legislature of 1949 of the Governor's proposal for a Federal reclamation project in an Hawaiian Homes Commission area, I quote herewith a resolution which was passed by the executive council of Hawaiian Civic Clubs at its meeting of December 6, 1949:

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas Congress of the United States of America did on July 9, 1921, enact the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act into Federal law and included same as part of the organic act of the Territory of Hawaii (sec. 201 to 223 inclusive) to provide the means and wherewithal for the rehabilitation of the native Hawaiians, especially those descendants of not less than one-half part of the blood of the races inhabiting the Hawaiian Islands previous to 1778; and

"Whereas, under said Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, certain parcels of the then existing public lands, being in the main remnants of the once vast crown lands of the Kingdom of Hawaii, were transferred to the control of the Hawaiian Homes Commission; and

"Whereas, with the approval of the Congress of the United States and with the whole-hearted consent of our own legislature additional lands were added to the holdings of the Hawaiian Homes Commission in the intervening years and during the same period amicable withdrawals of large tracts of Hawaiian home lands have been made for the use of the public in keeping with progress and the expansion of our highway systems, public utilities, airports, and the like; and

"Whereas, the Congress of the United States of America and the Legislature of Hawaii by virtue of the success of this rehabilitation project from its inception to this very day has not deemed it advisable to remove any parcel of land from the jurisdiction of the Hawaiian Homes Commission for any reason whatsoever; and

"Whereas there appeared in local newspapers references of a movement to ultimately remove from the control of the Hawaiian Homes Commission portions and/or all of the lands of Puukapu, Nienie, and Kamoku-Kapulena located in the districts of South Kohala and Hamakua, island of Hawaii, so that these same lands may be made available for settlement and use by persons not having the qualifications of a native Hawaiian; and

"Whereas, this purported movement is not in line with the intent and the requirements of existing laws and the sentiment of the majority of the people of the Territory of Hawaii through its duly elected senators and representatives, and with the intent and sentiment of the Congress of the United States when for the first time since the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act went into effect a similar movement was introduced, discussed, and not resolved by the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii which adjourned in May of this year: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the executive council of Hawaiian civic clubs, through its board of directors, that any attempt to remove from the control of the Hawaiian Homes Commission any of the parcels of lands under its control by coercion, political maneuver and/or subterfuge will not be condoned by it; that it will fight with every means of its command for the retention of both the Hawaiian Homes Commission and its limited but valued lands; that it will devote unstintingly of its time, effort, and influence to resist and/or suppress any attempt that would tend to hamper, mollify, or disrupt the rehabilitation program under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act; and be it further

"Resolved, That the President of the United States of America, President of the United States Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior, Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, the Delegate to Congress, the president of the senate and speaker of the house of representatives of the

twenty-fifth legislature, its holdover committee and subcommittee on public lands, the Hawaiian Homes Commission, members of the executive council of the Hawaiian civic clubs, and members of the executive council of the Hawaiian Homesteaders.

"Adopted this 6th day of December 1949 at Honolulu, T. H.

"LEON K. STERLING, Jr.,

"President, *Hawaiian Civic Club*.

"Dated this 6th day of December 1949, at Honolulu, T. H."

"This is to certify that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted by the Executive Council of Hawaiian Civic Clubs at its meeting held December 6, 1949.

"LEON K. STERLING, Jr.,

"President, *Executive Council of Hawaiian Civic Clubs*.

"Members of the Executive Council of Hawaiian Civic Clubs:

"Hawaiian Civic Club of Honolulu.

"Hawaiian Civic Club of Koolaupoko.

"Hawaiian Civic Club of Koolauloa.

"Hawaiian Civic Club of Waialua.

"Hawaiian Civic Club of Nanaikapono (Nanakuli).

"Hawaiian Civic Club of Pearl City (Ewa).

"Hawaiian Civic Club of Waimanalo.

"Junior Hawaiian Civic Club of Honolulu.

"Junior Hawaiian Civic Club of Koolaupoko."

Editorial comment supporting the Hawaiian Homes Commission has recently appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin as follows:

"IS HAWAIIAN HOMES ACT REALLY 'DISCRIMINATORY'? ¹

"One of the arguments raised against the Hawaiian Homes Act by its opponents is that it is discriminatory legislation.

"These opponents are Delegate Marguerite K. Ashford, of the constitutional convention, who would eliminate the Hawaiian homes project in writing Hawaii's State constitution, and Senator William J. Nobriga, of the Big Island, who has announced he is going to Washington to fight the project.

"Both contend as their principal arguments that the legislation is unconstitutional, it should not remain on the books because of its 'race discrimination' aspects.

* * * * *

"True, the Hawaiian Homes Act grants specific benefits to the Hawaiian people. That these benefits are, in fact, nothing more than a birthright which had been taken from them by an earlier injustice seems to have been overlooked by those who fight the project.

* * * * *

"But, even if we skip over the fact that the Hawaiian commoner did not get his share of the land in the great mahele (land partition) of 1847, let us examine the facts to see if discrimination does exist and, if so, who is hurt.

"There can be no discrimination unless there is an aggrieved person or group of persons.

"In the case of the Hawaiian Homes Act, there would be just grievance if the Hawaiian homes lands were the only lands available in the Territory and that others were deprived of the right to occupy or own lands because of the Homes Act.

"But this is not true, the Hawaiian homes land represent only a small fraction of the arable lands of the territory, and only a small fraction of the public domain.

"There is much desirable land which could be made available to farmers and ranchers if the Territorial lands commissioner would put it up for lease.

"It so happens that much of the Hawaiian homes acreage is marginal land—in some cases, worthless land.

"The Hawaiian Homes Commission would gladly part with some of this acreage because its opponents persist in using mouth-filling acreage figures when they point the accusing finger at the commission and its project.

"The Hawaiian homes lands on the south slopes of Haleakala on Maui are lava fields.

"The lands at South Point on Hawaii are barren and only occasionally support enough grass for grazing.

¹ Honolulu Star-Bulletin, May 2, 1950.

"The same is true of Kula lands on Maui, only a fraction of which can be used.

"There are lands on Kauai which cannot be used because the commission lacks funds to make them accessible.

"The Humuula lands on Hawaii are subject to killing frosts.

* * * * *

"It is ironic that the tracts which have been pointed to by the opponents of the homes project as areas which should not be held in trust for the Hawaiian people are two of the few productive areas in the project. One of the sections was considered of limited value until the Homes Commission developed water for it.

"And even if preference is acknowledged, there is ample precedent for preferential treatment in the history of Federal legislation.

"Legislation granting benefits to veterans is preferential legislation—but few Americans would deny them those preferences.

"The Wagner Act was preferential legislation, and it was upheld by the Supreme Court.

"Legislation establishing Indian reservations was preferential legislation, yet it has held the support of the American people, even when it was discovered that supposedly marginal land was rich in oil deposits.

* * * * *

"Yes, if preference is admitted, there is ample precedent to support it.

"But we do not acknowledge that preserving for the Hawaiians a small portion of their native land is anything more than obligation of the Government to correct a century-old injustice, to live up to a century-old agreement that was not kept.

"The Hawaiian homes law is a just law and basically it is a good law. We should proceed cautiously in seeking to change it."

"HOMES LAW GUARANTEES HAWAIIANS' BIRTHRIGHT"²

"One of the proposals offered in lieu of the Hawaiian Homes Act when the Territory of Hawaii becomes a State is that present tenants of Hawaiian homes lands be given that land in fee simple.

"Under the Hawaiian Homes Act, tenants have the land under 99-year leases, which is equivalent to life tenancy.

"At first glance the idea of giving the land to the tenants might seem to be an equitable means of paying an old debt to the Hawaiian people and at the same time terminating the homes project, which its opponents maintain is discriminatory.

* * * * *

"The charge of discrimination already has been answered in these columns.

* * * * *

"Actually giving the land to its present tenants will neither accomplish the purposes for which the Hawaiian Homes Act was passed, nor is it an equitable proposal.

"It would grant land to present tenants, but it would deny future applicants the opportunity to acquire lands under the Homes Act. This opportunity they will enjoy under the provisions of Delegate Farrington's House bill 49 which guarantees the continuation of the homes project under State government.

"It would defeat the purpose of the Homes Act because it would remove from trust the lands set aside in perpetuity for the use of the Hawaiian people.

"If the present tenants are given the land in fee simple, they will be at liberty to mortgage or sell it. This is precisely what the sponsors of the original homes legislation did not want, or they would have drafted the law that way.

"The then Delegate to Congress, the fearless and fighting J. Kuhio Kalaniana'ole, always argued that the lands should be held in perpetuity by the Territory.

* * * * *

"As has been pointed out before, the Hawaiian Homes Act was approved by Congress only after painstaking consideration of all its aspects, including its constitutionality.

"It was the intention of Congress to guarantee a perpetual farm and home acreage for the people of Hawaiian ancestry. There are so many safeguards in the law to insure this that the intent of the Federal lawmakers cannot be misunderstood.

* * * * *

² Honolulu Star-Bulletin, May 3, 1950.

"The Congressmen, who nearly 30 years ago voted for the act, did not want the Hawaiian people to be subjected to the pressures of shysters and promoters seeking to deprive them of their inheritance.

"This expresses no lack of confidence in the Hawaiian people. Landowners of other race ancestries have seen their inheritances taken from them by loan sharks and smooth-talking operators.

"Congress acted as it did because it realized that some of the people it was trying to help would not be able to resist the temptation to convert their land into cash or other assets of less secure value.

"It did not imply that the Hawaiians, as a group, were more susceptible to such pressures than anyone else; it merely said it wanted the Hawaiians to keep what they had and to eliminate the pressures.

* * * * *

"Many tenants of Hawaiian homes lands are everlastingly grateful that Congress framed the law as it did. In spite of bad times, they have had their homes and their little farms when others were forced to sell out. They have had a measure of security that could have been theirs in no other way.

"To remove these safeguards, these guaranties, would be to break faith with the Hawaiian people, to deprive them of a birthright that is justly theirs.

"The vast majority of the people of Hawaii do not want to see this happen."

It should be remembered that the Hawaiian Homes Commission besides, being limited in its activities to a certain acreage over each 5-year period, is likewise dependent upon the legislature for direct appropriations before it can proceed. An analysis of the Hawaiian Homes Commission lands will show that, except for the 8,000 acres on Molokai, the great bulk of the Commission lands is grazing land, and until 1947 there was no water available to them under its control. In that year water that had been under license was surrendered, and that made it possible to activate the plans. It should also be noted that the Territory administers over 400,000 acres of the public domain separate from Hawaiian Homes Commission lands. These lands are available to any of Hawaii's citizens for homesteading under provision 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act. It includes approximately 40,000 acres of excellent agricultural lands and several hundred thousand acres of pasture lands of varying quality.

Yours truly,

VICTOR S. K. HOUSTON.

[Honolulu Star-Bulletin, May 1, 1950]

HAWAIIAN HOMES ACT CORRECTED AN INJUSTICE

(NOTE.—Territorial Senator W. J. Nobriga is trying to smash the Hawaiian Homes Commission. He asserts that setting apart lands for use by Hawaiians is unconstitutional because it is "discriminatory." He has gone to Washington for the Hawaii statehood hearings which opened today. He hopes to get an expression of opinion there that will knock the Hawaiian Homes Act provision out of the State constitution for Hawaii now being drafted. This is one of a series of editorials dealing with the present provision in Hawaii's organic act, and with the need for retaining its principles in the new constitution.)

The Hawaiian Homes Act of Congress is under fire.

In the constitutional convention an attempt is being made by Delegate Marguerite K. Ashford of Molokai to read it out of the law when Hawaii's State constitution is adopted.

And Senator William J. Nobriga of the big island is waging a fight of his own to destroy the Hawaiian homes project.

Neither has been given much support here. So Senator Nobriga has gone to Washington.

In order to understand the basis for the Hawaiian Homes Act, it is necessary to know the arguments that were presented to Congress in 1920 and 1921 in support of it.

There was strong sentiment for the Hawaiians in those arguments. But there was also strong practical sense.

These arguments when made by Delegate Prince Kuhio Kalanianaʻole with the support of the Territorial legislature and the legal endorsement of the Territorial attorney general, stemmed in part from an injustice of the great Mahele (land partition) of 1847.

At that time, the lands were to be divided in substantially equal amounts among the crown, the nobles, and the commoners, with one third of each share retained by the government as public lands.

The people's share was the smallest of the three, roughly 900,000 acres. And because of "jokers" in the regulations specifying the manner in which title was to be secured, only about 28,000 acres ever found their way into the legal possession of the commoners.

The rest reverted to the government, and passed on to the Republic of Hawaii as government lands.

When Hawaii was annexed, these same lands became a part of the United States domain. Congress deputized the Territorial government to act as the agent of the Federal Government in administering these lands, and granted the Territory the use of revenues from rents.

It was, then, on the moral issue, buttressed by logic, that at least a portion of these public lands were properly the birthright of individual Hawaiians that the case for the Hawaiian Homes Act was made.

In some respects (but by no means all respects) there was a parallel between the Hawaiian Homes Act and legislation providing for reservations set apart for the Indian tribes of the mainland.

It was a recognition of the moral right of the first settlers to possession of lands for their homes, farms, pastures.

The other major argument offered at the time (1920) was that the Hawaiian race was dying out because it was having difficulty adjusting itself to the fast pace of the white man's civilization, and that securing a portion of the land for the Hawaiians would be the means of rehabilitating the race.

Congress accepted these arguments and enacted the Hawaiian Homes Act. This set aside a portion of the Federal lands in Hawaii for the exclusive use of the Hawaiian people for homesites and farms. Provisions were made for a revolving fund to provide loans for constructing buildings. Land rent was nominal, and the 99-year leases were nontransferable.

Amendments have been made to the Hawaiian Homes Act from time to time. But the basic premises upon which the law was enacted have never been altered. And the language of the act makes it plain that it was the intention of Congress that these lands were to be preserved in perpetuity for the Hawaiian people.

This is evident in the legitimate and common-sense device of incorporating the Hawaiian Homes Act in the organic act of the Territory. Here is plain proof of intent to insure the permanence of the legislation.

It is therefore likely that, in the present situation, Congress, sensitive to this expressed intent, will not be inclined to precipitous action to take these lands away from the Hawaiian people who now occupy them, or the Hawaiian people who, in the future, may make claim to them.

The language of the Federal act also is a warning to the people of Hawaii to proceed slowly and with utmost consideration in any attempt to set aside legislation whose permanency has had a continuing stamp of congressional approval for three decades.

[Honolulu Star-Bulletin, May 4, 1950]

HAWAIIAN HOMES ACT HAS SURVIVED SHARP ATTACKS

The Hawaiian Homes Commission project, now under fire from two sources, has been the object of much criticism based on misinformation.

But it has survived nearly 30 years, and its recent administration has won much and widespread approbation.

The cumulative effect of this past criticism has been to create doubt as to the true intent of the Homes Act and its manner of administration.

When the Homes Commission was created by congressional act in 1920, an appropriation was set up for a revolving fund from which prospective homesteaders could borrow to build homes and farm buildings.

Through some oversight, no provision was made for administrative expenses of the Commission and its staff, with the result that much of the revolving fund had to be diverted for administration.

That situation was subsequently corrected to some degree. But later commissions have always been handicapped by a shortage of funds, with the result that the rehabilitation project has not been able to grow as rapidly as the need for it developed.

This, of course, gave rise to many criticisms, particularly among applicants who were turned down because the Commission lacked funds to accommodate them.

Inadequate funds have forestalled many important development projects—water on Molokai and Hawaii, highways and utilities on Kauai—which would have made more land available for homesteading.

And today, the statutory limitations on the amount of loans which can be made to individual homesteaders are a severe handicap in view of present-day building costs. The law now allows the Commission to lend \$3,000 for a residence and \$5,000 for a farm. Neither of these amounts is adequate for the purpose.

These handicaps can be traced not to the Commission or its staff, nor to the principle upon which the Homes Act was based, but to the legislative bodies which have not provided adequate funds to do the job as it might be done.

Some of the shortcomings growing out of restricted revenues have been used as arguments by those who would now destroy the homes project.

Unless these arguments are examined in the light of historic fact, they could tend to alienate support for the homes project itself.

As has been pointed out in previous discussion of the homes project in these columns, the Hawaiian Homes Act was based upon two things:

1. Correcting an injustice growing out of the great mahele (land partition) of 1847, when the commoners, entitled to some 900,000 acres of land, actually got only about 28,000 as the result of a joker in the regulations for securing land titles.

2. Providing for the rehabilitation of the Hawaiian race which was fast dying out under the undesirable living conditions of the Hawaiians at that time (1920) in crowded cities. The Homes Act was designed as a means of getting them out of the cities and back to the soil, as well as a means of giving them lands to which they were rightfully entitled.

Today, opponents of the Homes Act challenge it on the basis of race discrimination when actually it cannot be shown that anyone is being hurt by this alleged discrimination.

In the early years of the homes project, attacks of this sort were not heard because the land allotted to the project was, in the main, marginal in character.

Now that the Homes Commission, after years of husbanding its resources, has been able to make some areas valuable by developing water, there is a strange new interest in smashing the project.

It would be shabby, indeed, for the Territory at this time to break its promise to the Hawaiian people and deny them land they had been assured would be theirs for 99 years which really means for the rest of their lives.

It would be going back on a promise, and renewing the injustice done in the mahele more than a century ago.

And what would be gained by doing this? A few thousand acres of marginal land would be opened up to bids—and those who already have considerable resource would be in the best position to gain possession of these areas.

Is that what the people of Hawaii want?

[Honolulu Advertiser, May 3, 1950]

HAWAIIANS ON THE LAND

Attempts to deprive people of Hawaiian blood of the consideration that is shown them by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act bring no credit to the Territory. Whether there is a constitutional technicality through which the Homes Act can be set aside or not, it is a poor business to hunt for one. The moral obligation of the community to the Hawaiians is plain. They have little enough in the homelands that have been restricted to their occupancy in repayment for the invasion of latecomers who have possessed themselves of a lion's share of the island's area.

The Hawaiian Homes Act is an instrument of Congress. It could be repealed by Congress if that national legislative body should someday see fit to take such action. It is the duty of the people of Hawaii to take any further steps they may to safeguard against this possibility. Inclusion of the homes provision in the new State constitution, therefore, is imperative.

The argument that the Homes Act is discriminatory against people of other bloods in Hawaii is bosh. Hawaiians pioneered these islands. They permitted outsiders to share their lands with them, made them welcome with vast hospitality. It is a poor reward for that graciousness to seek now to take away from them the last remaining privilege that is theirs through heritage.

[Maui News, May 6, 1950]

SQUARE DEAL FOR NATIVE HAWAIIANS

Marguerite Ashford's many admiring constituents in Maui County, and particularly on her home island of Molokai, were shocked this week to learn that the constitutional delegate from the Friendly Isle had proposed the elimination of the Hawaiian Homes Commission principle from the State constitution.

Miss Ashford joins a feeble minority headed by Senator W. J. Nobriga of Hawaii in this effort to destroy a structure designed solely to perpetuate the Hawaiian race as a self-sustaining, self-respecting component of its native land. She has proposed that we renege on the part-payment to the natives of Hawaii Nei whose lands were appropriated by Federal and Territorial Governments. She suggests that we foresake an obligation that cannot honorably be discarded or ignored.

Miss Ashford says that the Hawaiian Homes principle is discriminatory and unconstitutional. Taking the last first, we might suggest to the lady from Molokai that the act of Congress has been on the books for 30 years, since the days of beloved Kuhio. It has long since passed through its period of legal and practical trial.

If being fair and just to the natives of a land is discriminatory we suppose Miss Ashford wins a point, but we do not share in this narrow interpretation of the obligation of a government to indigenous people. The Federal Government has maintained reservations for the natives of America without being charged with discrimination, although it must be admitted that the administration of the Hawaiian Homes Commission has always been exemplary in comparison with the negligence, graft and corruption that has marked the administration of Indian affairs.

While a separate Commission administers to the affairs of Hawaiian Homes settlers, there is also a department of government charged with providing homestead lands for persons of other racial strains, thus completely obliterating Miss Ashford's rather naive charge of discrimination.

If Miss Ashford would apply her outstanding talents in the direction of correcting admitted existing flaws and inconsistencies in the Hawaiian Homes Act, if she would interest her energetic self in broadening the government's policies in general homestead matters and if she would assume the leadership in making certain that adequate lands are made available for homesteading on the part of all persons desiring to do so in Hawaii, she would be making a lasting contribution to the welfare of the future State of Hawaii.

Attacking the Hawaiian Homes Act and depriving the native Hawaiian of his little plot of farm land is unbecoming to the lady of Molokai, especially when one remembers that a very substantial part of her county-wide support came from the Hawaiian Homes area at Hoolehewa.

[Honolulu Star-Bulletin, May 6, 1950]

MOLOKAI PEOPLE SPEAK UP FOR HOMESTEADS

The Hawaiian homesteaders of Molokai are indignant and deeply hurt by the fight a fellow Molokai resident, Miss Marguerite K. Ashford, is waging in the constitutional convention to destroy the Hawaiian Homes project.

These fine people, who have struggled for more than 20 years under adverse conditions to get out of debt, now see the labors of a quarter of a century threatened.

They see one of their own islander residents trying to slam the door in the face of others who would use the Hawaiian Homes Act to establish their homes and farms on their native soil.

Though their hearts are heavy with the sorrow of this betrayal, they are trying in their protest to the convention to base their appeal on unemotional reasoning.

The arguments their committees are setting forth in petitions to be presented to the convention are much the same arguments which have been set forth in these columns.

By their action of protest, the people of Molokai are letting it be known that they do not support the position of the delegate they elected to the convention.

This repudiation of Miss Ashford's stand is significant. Coupled with the rejection at the polls of Senator William J. Nobriga, who campaigned for a con-

vention seat on the promise to fight the homes act, it is a further evidence that the move to destroy the Hawaiian Homes project does not enjoy general public support.

[Honolulu Advertiser, May 7, 1950]

HOMES COMMISSION ACT, A SOLELY HAWAIIAN LAW, FOR AN ANCIENT HERITAGE

(By Jared G. Smith)

The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 became law by congressional enactment on July 9, 1921, 6 months before the death of its sponsor, Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaʻole, Hawaii's delegate. He had served the people of this Territory in Congress almost continuously since 1902 as the standard bearer of the Republican Party, having been defeated for reelection only once, during the President Wilson regime when the whole country went Democratic.

This law more than any other relates solely to Hawaiian affairs and yet is a statute at large in the code of laws of the United States. It transfers the control of certain portions of the public domain from the Commissioner of Public Lands, as provided in the organic act, to the Hawaiian Homes Commission, the latter authorized to lease these lands to "any decedent of not less than one-half part of the blood of the races inhabiting the Hawaiian Islands previous to 1778."

Portions of the designated endowment exempted from Hawaiian Homes Commission control included land within forest reserves, all cultivated sugar lands, and all parcels then covered by the various homestead agreements, these to remain under control by the Commissioner of Public Lands.

The law covers every possible contingency in great detail and at the end says: "The Congress of the United States reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal the provisions of this title"—something that our Constitution makers may have overlooked.

The Governor appointed a strong commission which met, organized, and plunged into the matter of selecting Hawaiian settlers, willing and able to farm. This was not a lottery, as the Waiakea homesteading venture had been, but a careful character screening and selection in which preference was given to Hawaiians with large families. The prize was a 99-year lease at a rental of \$1 a year and taxes—and unlimited opportunity.

The commission decided that the first settlement should be essayed on Hoolehua and Palaaui. West Molokai, an area of about 30,000 acres with plenty of plow land, moderate rainfall, and potential irrigation sources, which would have been in sugarcane if an earlier plantation venture had not failed, which is another story.

Having decided that this was the place to start, the Hawaiian Homes Commission invited a group of what former Senator George P. Cooke, of Molokai, termed "so-called experts" to meet with them and Kuhio on the ground to give advice: Albert Horner, Frederick G. Krauss, and yours truly. The meeting was at the senator's ranch headquarters.

Albert Horner came prepared, having presented his opinions in writing. Dr. Krauss and I wanted to study the sites first. Our reports were never published, it having developed when too late that the official stenographer had imbibed so much of mine host Cooke's liquid refreshments that his stenographic pothooks were illegible.

That night neither Prince Cupid nor I could sleep. While the rest of the party snored we sat on his lanai and talked, he unburdening his soul about his dreams and aspirations for the future of the Hawaiian people. We talked until dawn and the beginning of what he intended to be and was confident would be a new day for the fine American citizens of his ancient race.

So I say to all—leave the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 alone. It is a good law which, properly administered, will preserve to the native Hawaiians their ancient heritage. It is a wise law enacted by the Congress of the United States. Hands off!

The CHAIRMAN. There are numerous telegrams which will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The telegrams are as follows:)

Do something about Hawaiian Homes Commission law. It hurts everybody.

HIDETSURA MIURA,
Haina, Hawaii.

Hawaii's entire welfare demands Hawaiian Homes Commission be abolished there and now please.

ISAO KITAGAWA,
Haina, Hawaii.

Absolutely no place in our basic law for Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

WALLACE SHIMOBATA,
Kalopa, Hawaii.

Give Hawaiians opportunity to own land not just lease, so terminate Hawaiian Homes.

JOAQUIN PESTANA,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

We want statehood but we don't want the Hawaiian Homes Commission, thank you.

JAMES CARVALHO,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

Is statehood for everybody or just a few? Repeal Hawaiian Homes part, please.

WALTER GONSALVES,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

As for me, give me change for land or get me nothing. Kill HHC.

CHARLES PAIVA,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

Hawaiian economy strangled by Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. Please repeal it.

WALTER PARESA,
Haina, Hawaii.

We want statehood but we need repeal of Hawaiian Homes part of bill.

T. HIGASHI,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

Please do away with Hawaii Homes Commission Act before statehood.

K. HIRAKO,
Kamuela, Hawaii.

Statehood urgently necessary but Hawaiian Homes Commission provisions are unfair to everybody.

MANUEL ARRUDA, Sr.,
Hilo, Hawaii.

Nobody pays my trip there because I'm against Hawaiian Homes Commission deal.

EDWIN AGUIAR,
Hilo, Hawaii.

Not what to do about statehood but what to do about Hawaiian Homes.

ALBERT SILVA,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

Put statehood witnesses under oath and nearly all will agree with Nobriga.

ADAM THOMATOKAA,
Hawaii.

Senator Nobriga, of Hawaii, will speak our real sentiments about statehood here.

JOSEPH SERRAO,
Hilo, Hawaii.

Impossible do business with Farrington, so urge you let Territorial Senator Nobriga talk.

ADAM ANTONE,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

Am indignant that all statehood witnesses except Hawaii Senator Nobriga evasive of facts.

DAN CORREIRA,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

Listen to our Senator William Nobriga for our true statehood feelings.

BEN DE SILVA, Jr.,
Hilo, Hawaii.

Don't let nobody stop our good Senator William Nobriga from talking about homes.

JOHN PERREIRA,
Hilo, Hawaii.

High time land situation here spotlighted and Nobriga man to do it.

WILLIAM FERREIRA,
Hamakua, Hawaii.

Suggest Hawaii Senator Nobriga key statehood witness most honest and best-informed Aloha.

ROBERT LEONG,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

Don't becloud issue for Hawaiian land law crux of statehood problem. See Norbriga.

BOYD VINCENT,
Hilo, Hawaii.

Statehood witnesses left out small people except maybe Senator Nobriga.

WILLIAM ANDRADE,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

Get the real picture on statehood from Hawaii Senator William Nobriga.

GEORGE CARVALHO,
Haina, Hawaii.

Get facts from witness William Nobriga before concluding on statehood bill before you.

JENNIE YAMADA,
Hilo, Hawaii.

Call to your attention that all statehood witnesses there squelched except Senator Nobriga.

FRED PAULOS,
Hilo, Hawaii.

Respectfully ask you give closest attention to testimony by Hawaii Senator William Nobriga.

JOE MEDEIROS,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

Please, Mr. Committee, believe Senator Nobriga, not Delegate Farrington.

MARY RAMOS,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

Statehood witnesses there hand-picked by Farrington. Hope you hear Nobriga and Governor Stainback.

JOHN ANDRADE,
Haina, Hawaii.

Don't let Farrington gang up on Hawaii Senator Nobriga who has real facts.

GEORGE COSTA,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

Air statehood properly heeding local Senator Nobriga, who has courage to speak truthfully.

TONY PHILLIPS,
Hilo, Hawaii.

Nobriga is right, so why let anybody tell you he is not.

MRS. ROSE ANDRADE,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

Only statehood witness I see who knows what is what is Senator Nobriga.

CHARLES MENDES,
Haina, Hawaii.

Protest public funds used for onesided statehood witnesses, therefore give Nobriga full attention, please.

HERMAN CORDEIRO,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

Our Senator Nobriga has real facts and figures on H. R. 49, hear him.

RUTH HIRATA,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

Don't let big shots gag Hawaii Senator Nobriga when he talk to you.

JAMES SOUZA,
Hilo, Hawaii.

Not as unanimous as you think until something done about Hawaiian Homes Commission.

WILLIAM HART,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

Please do not impose Hawaiian Homes Commission on us any longer.

MANUEL LAWRENCE,
Haina, Hawaii.

There can be on real democracy in Hawaii until Hawaiian Homes Commission abolished.

ALEXANDER CARVALHO,
Hilo, Hawaii.

Hawaiian Homes provisions in H. R. 49 contrary to best interests of people of Hawaii.

MASARU MATSUNAMI,
Haina, Hawaii.

Economic conditions here impossible under Hawaiian Homes Commission law. Do away with it.

JANET KOTAKE,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

Statehood o. k. if no more Hawaiian Homes Commission, which is bad.

D. BOTELHO,
Haina, Hawaii.

Hawaii cannot develop unless you kill unfair Hawaiian Homes Commission provisions.

TAICHI YAHATA,
Kopulena, Hawaii.

Opposed to Hawaiian Homes provisions of statehood bill before your committee.

JOSEPH DE MELLO,
Hilo, Hawaii.

I oppose Hawaiian Homes Commission part of H. R. 49.

MELVIN SOUZA,
Hilo, Hawaii.

Glad to have Senate which can correct harmful Hawaiian Homes provisions of statehood bill.

ERNEST TEXIRA,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

Think it shamefully wrong that H. R. 49 includes Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

M. OKURA,
Kamuela, Hawaii.

Have a heart. Give us a break. Repeal Hawaiian Homes Commission law.

MORIO TAKAE,
Kukuihaele, Hawaii.

No statehood please unless Hawaii Homes Commission Act is killed.

DAVID FURTADO,
Hilo, Hawaii.

Our whole future depends on whether you remove Hawaiian Homes clause. Please do.

JOHN TEVES,
Haina, Hawaii.

As former democratic legislator here emphasize people resent Hawaiian Homes Commission parts of statehood enabling act as passed by House of Representatives there.

AMOS IGNACIO,
Haina, Hawaii.

Re statehood, please erase section 3 of bill re Hawaiian Homes Commission here.

KAZUKOSHI FUJINO.

Many people here afraid of statehood unless Hawaiian Homes Commission provisions all stricken.

WILLIAM AWONG,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

Inconceivable to me that statehood and Hawaiian Homes be tied together. Aloha nui.

SOHEI ARAKIGI,
Honolulu, Hawaii.

Hawaiian Homes Commission provision of H. R. 49 vicious affair with no place under statehood.

HERBERT ONAGA,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

Yes; I want statehood, but without unfair Hawaiian Homes Commission provisions. Delete them.

RAYMOND GOMES,
Honokaa, Hawaii.

I state my unqualified opposition to Hawaiian Homes Commission in Statehood Enabling Act.

HARRIS YAMAMOTO, *Kopulena, Hawaii.*

As an Hawaiian I object to treatment under Homes law as heartless and brutal.

KEHAUNANI THOMPSON, *Hawaii National Park.*

Imperative to Hawaii farmers that Home Commission Act be removed from H. R. 49.

S. YOHSIKANI, *legislative committee, chairman, Kamuela Farm Bureau.*

Let our constitutional convention decide what to do with Hawaiian Homes Commission.

KIYOSHI MURAKAMI, *Honokaa, Hawaii.*

Statehood is our right but we don't want Hawaiian Homes Commission with it.

MANUEL SOARES, *Honokaa, Hawaii.*

Statehood yes, but not at the price of unfair Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

JOSEPH MARQUES, *Honokaa, Hawaii.*

Hawaii will double in value to Nation with removal of Hawaiian Homes Commission.

CHARLES BARRIS, *Honokaa, Hawaii.*

Hawaiian Homes Commission Act discriminatory and oppressive. Best thing to kill it entirely.

JAMES NAKAO, *Honokaa, Hawaii.*

Abolition of Hawaiian Homes would be the fair deal for us in Hawaii.

RALPH BRANCO, *Honokaa, Hawaii.*

Hawaiian Homes provisions must be excluded from statehood in best interests of everybody.

MASASHI SASAKI, *Honokaa, Hawaii.*

Statehood meaningless unless we get rid of Hawaiian Homes Commission.

JOHN RAPOZA, *Hilo, Hawaii.*

Hawaiian Homes Commission law no good please. Do something for us.

GEORGE MENINO, *Hilo, Hawaii.*

Statehood with present Hawaiian land laws would be terrible farce.

SADAO TANAKA, *Honokaa, Hawaii.*

Abolition of Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of utmost urgency at this time.

M. KAWABATA, *Kamuela, Hawaii.*

Land monopoly here bad enough without HHC, so please drop it right now.

D. L. JOHANSEN, *Honokaa, Hawaii.*

Please see that Hawaii Senator Nobriga gets opportunity to explain Hawaiian homes unfairness.

C. L. JENKINS, *Honokaa, Hawaii.*

Hawaiian homes law tragic mistake, so don't make it again please.

E. Y. KANESHIRO, *Honokaa, Hawaii.*

Hawaiian statehood world-wide significance only if Hawaiian homes aspect dropped from H. R. 49.

WILLIAM TAMORE, *Honokaa, Hawaii.*

Please be fair, help Hawaii by repealing awful Hawaiian Homes Commission law.

LAUR FELICIANO, *Haina, Hawaii.*

Put me on record against Hawaiian homes law in statement bill before you.

MASAO FUJII, *Kopulena, Hawaii.*

Appeal to you to assure unrestricted unlimited statehood testimony by Hawaiian Senator Nobriga.

DOUGLAS MATSUDA, *Haina, Hawaii.*

Statehood vitally essential but so is repeal of Hawaiian Homes Commission laws.

STANLEY MONIZ, *Honokaa, Hawaii.*

Outrageous that statehood measure should tie in Hawaiian Homes Commission provisions.

G. R. OLIVAL, *Honokaa, Hawaii.*

Please ignore anyone trying to sell you Hawaiian Homes Commission. It is rotten.

TONY OLIVEIRA, *Hilo, Hawaii.*

Please take Hawaiian Homes Commission part out of statehood law.

SHOICHI SHIGEMATSU, *Honokaa, Hawaii.*

The CHAIRMAN. We will call Mr. Nobriga now and get his explanation.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM J. NOBRIGA, MEMBER OF THE SENATE OF HAWAII

Mr. NOBRIGA. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, my name is William J. Nobriga. I am a senator from the first district. I served in the house of representatives for two terms, or 4 years. In 1946 I ran for the short-term senate.

At that time, as you know, the PAC was quite in control of politics in Hawaii. I waged a one-man war against PAC, and I was defeated. I want to say that in the primary my opponent, a Democratic opponent, led the ticket by some 7,000 votes. I had to eliminate my Republican opponent. I had to come back in the general, and I only missed by some 800 votes.

I attempted to divide the people into two groups: The PAC voters and the independent voters.

I pointed out to the people at that time the dangers of Communist-inspired politicians and policy at that time.

I am now chairman of the subcommittee on lands of the 1949 hold-over committee. I served as chairman of the agricultural committee in the regular session of 1949. I may point out that when I ran for the senate in 1948, I led the ticket by some 1,200 votes over the second candidate.

I am married and my wife is a school teacher in the public schools. She is of Hawaiian, Chinese, and Caucasian extraction. Her brother is a graduate of Annapolis, a commander in the Navy. I have two sisters in California and many relatives who live there. I was also educated in the public schools of Hawaii.

I would like to state in my opening remarks that I am for statehood. I feel that we in the Territory are ready for statehood. I feel that we have met the qualifications that have been based on the standards and various requirements that have been advanced by Congress. I feel that Hawaii can make some definite contribution to the United States if admitted to statehood. I feel that our biggest contribution is racial tolerance.

As you know, this is a very basic and fundamental principle upon which this country is based. Because of the intermingling of these

various racial cultures in Hawaii, we have come out with an end product of racial understanding which I feel is one of the greatest sources of hope for the future, not only for the United States but for the world in general.

I would like to confine my remarks and my testimony to the question of the Hawaiian Homes Commission from now on. I wanted to make that opening remark to show that I am definitely for statehood.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me say for the record that a summary of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act has been prepared by Mr. Silverman of the Department of the Interior, and will be made a part of the record.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

DIVISION OF TERRITORIES AND ISLAND POSSESSIONS

WASHINGTON, *May 10, 1950.*

MEMORANDUM

To : Senator O'Mahoney.

From : Irwin W. Silverman.

Subject : Legislative history and background on the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

You have requested additional information with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. I have, over a period of years, made a detailed study of the legislative history and provisions of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, and I feel the following material may be of assistance to you in determining the advisability of retaining the provision of H. R. 49 relating to the Hawaiian Homes Commission.

The Hawaiian Homes Commission was established by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, approved by the President on July 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 108, U. S. C. secs. 671-718). This act was the direct result of a concurrent resolution passed by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii during the 1919 session, authorizing the Governor of Hawaii to appoint a "legislative commission of the Territory" to come to Washington and assist the Territorial Delegate to the Congress in formulating legislation which would establish the Hawaiian Homes Commission. The primary factors motivating the Territorial legislature's request for the Congress' enactment of this legislation were:

First. Concern over the sharp decline in the "native Hawaiian" population. Statistics were presented to the House Committee on the Territories showing that the "native Hawaiian" population had decreased from an estimate 142,650 in the year 1826 to an estimated 22,600 in June of 1919. At the time the "native Hawaiians" were considered to be a dying race (see H. Rept. 839, 66th Cong., 2d sess., p. 2).

Second. Recognition of the fact that the "native Hawaiian" people had never received the lands to which they were historically entitled. In 1845 an act was passed in Hawaii establishing a board of royal commissioners to quiet land titles. This board decided that there were three classes of vested original rights in land—those of the king or government, the chiefs, and the people—and these three classes or rights were about equal in extent. The division of lands of the Kingdom of Hawaii, known as the Great Māhele, took place in 1847. The King and the chiefs received 1,619,000 acres and the government of Hawaii 1,505,460 acres. Of the balance, approximately 984,000 acres, the people received only 28,000 acres. Theoretically, the people were entitled to one-third of the land. This right, however, was absolutely dependent upon the presentation of these claims to the board of land commissioners, and no matter how strong a claim or right a native Hawaiian may have had to a piece of land, unless that claim was presented to and allowed by the board of land commissioners he could not, after the board had completed its work, successfully assert title to the land. The practical difficulties involved in making these claims were apparently such that only 28,000 acres were awarded by the board to the people of Hawaii, as distinguished from the King and the chiefs. The remainder of the one-third share of the people reverted to the Crown. This remainder subsequently became public lands of the Republic of Hawaii.

In 1895 the Republic of Hawaii enacted a homestead law which was continued in force in an amended form by section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act. Homesteads were lost to "native Hawaiians" for various reasons, such as inexperience, failure to fulfill conditions necessary to obtain patents, and inability to finance farming operations. In addition, many "native Hawaiians" were prevailed upon to alienate their interest in their homesteads to wealthy interests and land speculators. This process of separating the "native Hawaiian" from his homestead rights reached such an extent that the tax returns for 1919 indicated that "native Hawaiians" held only 6.23 percent of the property of the Hawaiian Islands, and for the most part this property was in the possession of approximately 1,000 wealthy Hawaiians, the descendants of the chiefs. Because of the historical land and economic pattern in Hawaii, the "native Hawaiians," in general, proved singularly unable to adapt themselves to the changing economic conditions. By the year 1919 the need for special measures to protect "native Hawaiians" had become clear to both the Territorial and Federal Governments.

The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act was designed to rehabilitate "native Hawaiians" by making homesteads available to them and by providing financial assistance which would enable them to become self-sustaining farmers.

To accomplish these objectives the act set aside lands then estimated at approximately 195,00 acres of undeveloped agricultural and pastoral lands, to be administered for the benefit of "native Hawaiians" by a Hawaiian Homes Commission consisting of five members to be appointed by the Governor of Hawaii. The Commission was authorized to lease lands to "native Hawaiians" for agricultural, pastoral, and residential purposes. The term "native Hawaiian" was defined in the act as "any descendant of not less than one-half part of the blood of the races inhabiting the Hawaiian Islands previous to 1778."

In order to provide the funds required for farm development loans to "native Hawaiians" and for the authorized activities of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, the act provided for a revolving fund in the amount of \$1,000,000, later increased to \$2,000,000. It should be emphasized that the Homes Commission is not a Federal agency and that no Federal funds have ever been appropriated for this purpose. The act provided, however, that 30 percent of the receipts derived by the Territory from the leasing of cultivated sugarcane lands or from water licenses were to be covered into this fund. These territorial receipts have been the main source of revenue of this revolving fund. Revenues received from the repayment by "native Hawaiians" of loans made to them by the commission, and from the leasing of Hawaiian home lands are also covered into this fund.

The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, as amended, was the solution worked out by the Congress in order to fulfill its obligations to the "native Hawaiians." It involved the setting aside of certain lands to be used for the benefit of these people. H. R. 49 would provide that these lands shall continue to be administered for the benefit of "native Hawaiians" in accordance with the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, as amended, and that any material departure therefrom would require the consent of the Congress.

It should be noted, for the record, that the substance of this provision of H. R. 49 was contained in the Hawaiian statehood bill introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress and which was drafted by the Hawaiian Statehood Commission. It is interesting to note that, just as the original proposal for the enactment by the Congress of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, so also, the proposal contained in H. R. 49 emanated from the Legislature of Hawaii.

It is suggested that the provision contained in H. R. 49, providing for the continuance of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, be retained. This provision would be in the nature of a compact between the United States and the proposed State of Hawaii to the effect that the lands, designated as Hawaiian home lands, set aside for the benefit of "native Hawaiians," would continue to be administered for that purpose. This provision would insure that the interests vested in "native Hawaiians" by virtue of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act will be protected.

IRWIN W. SILVERMAN,
Chief Counsel.

Mr. NOBRIGA. Mr. Chairman, the Hawaiian Islands which lie in the Pacific Ocean, a very integral part of the United States of America for more than half a century, now plead before this Congress for a collective status co-equal with the existing States of the Union. H. R.

49, an act to enable the people of Hawaii to form a State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, has been adopted by the House of Representatives and now pends before the Senate.

As adopted by the House of Representatives, however, H. R. 49 contains a provision, embodied in section 3, which would mandate the people of Hawaii, as a compact with the United States relating to the management and disposition of what are known as Hawaiian home lands, to adopt the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, as a basic law of the State, subject to amendment or repeal only with the consent of the United States.

Without precedent in the admission to the Union of any of the present 48 States, this provision by its very nature is incongruous and incompatible with the fundamental intent and spirit of the measure and is repugnant to the people of Hawaii. Its inclusion within the enabling act is *prima facie* acknowledgement by its sponsor of its lack of merit and its certain unacceptability to a majority of the citizens of Hawaii.

Among the other citizens of Hawaii who have given or will give conspicuous testimony before this committee are those who also object to this provision as flagitiously unjust and unfair, but who refrain from protest for fear that it might jeopardize favorable Senate action on H. R. 49 as a whole. As a member of Hawaii's Territorial senate and as chairman of the lands subcommittee of the holdover committee of the 1949 legislature, it is my position that retention in H. R. 49 of the present provision relating to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act indeed would be reason, sufficient and proper, to refuse statehood to Hawaii.

The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, incorporated by Congress into the Hawaiian Organic Act in 1920, established the Hawaiian Homes Commission and reserved to it 169,384 acres of the public domain, scattered among the various islands, for lease to persons of one-half or more Hawaiian blood.

It also established from Territorial revenues a revolving fund of \$1,000,000, increased in 1928 to \$2,000,000, for loans to lessees for building purposes.

The purpose of the legislation, it was argued before Congress at the time of enactment, was for the betterment of the conditions of native Hawaiians who, through the avarice of others both prior to and after annexation to the United States, had been divested of their homes and lands.

Gentlemen of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, in intent, in operation, in its whole relation to fact and circumstance, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act is and ever will be a cruel travesty.

Hawaii comprises seven inhabited islands which have a total land area of 4,118,400 acres of 6,390 square miles, ranging from wet mountain slopes and barren lava deserts, neither of which are inhabitable or productive, to some of the richest and most bountiful soil in the world, and its climate uniquely ranges from tropical through temperate to frigid.

Of this area, departments and agencies of the United States Government own 226,870 acres, equal to 5½ percent of the total. These are: (a) Department of Army and the Air Force with 33,290 acres;

(*b*) Department of Navy with 28,590 acres; (*c*) Department of the Interior (Hawaii National Park) with 164,205 acres; (*d*) Coast Guard, Immigration Service, Postal Service, and Civil Aeronautics Administration with 785 acres.

The Territory of Hawaii owns 1,535,180 acres of the land, equal to 37½ percent of the total, in the following categories: (*a*) 40,090 acres under lease for agricultural purposes; (*b*) 510,780 acres rented for pasturage lands; (*c*) 681,705 acres held as forest reserves; (*d*) 19,770 acres utilized for homesteads and household lots; (*e*) 525 acres in business property; (*f*) 260,935 acres in highways, unleased and waste lands; (*g*) 21,375 acres reserved for miscellaneous public purposes.

Thus of the total area of the Territory of Hawaii, 42¾ percent is owned by the Federal or Territorial Governments.

This leaves 2,356,350 acres, 57¼ percent of the total, in private ownership, divided into the following categories: (*a*) 288,165 acres, a little more than 10 percent, devoted to agricultural crops, with 201,965 acres under cultivation to sugarcane, but sugar plantations themselves owning only 130,250 acres and leasing the remainder from private individuals or estates; there are 25,000 acres devoted to diversified farming; (*b*) 840,210 acres in pasturage, but with only 671,240 acres owned by ranchers and the remainder leased from private sources; (*c*) 363,380 acres involved in forest reserves and restricted watershed areas; (*d*) 864,595 acres which lie within the cities and towns of the Territory.

Over this 57¼ percent of the land which is held in private ownership, there is a monopoly which is conducive neither to a prosperous economy nor to a healthy and happy citizenry.

There are, for example, 10 private estates—and I have a chart to show that in this little booklet—trust estates and corporations, largely in the possession of members of the Hawaiian race, which own more than 3 times as much of the land as is owned by all other private land owners together; there are 100 private estates, trust estates, and corporations, exclusive of the 10 before named, which own more than 5 times as much of the land as is owned by all other private landowners together.

(The booklet referred to above, *Everybody Loves the Hawaiians*, may be found in the files of the committee.)

Mr. NOBRIGA. Hawaii's population exceeds half a million persons. Yet there are only 30,000 landowners, and only 26,262 are home owners, their total holdings worth only \$73,000,000 or an average of less than \$3,000 each, and 3,600 of these are farmers.

This is important, gentlemen of the Senate: Only 15 percent of the population is comprised of Hawaiians and Part-Hawaiians. Yet Hawaiians and Part-Hawaiians own 45 percent or almost half of all the privately-owned land in the islands. For example, of the five largest private estates, three are those of Hawaiians:

First, and Hawaiian, is the Bernice Pauahi Bishop estate, which holds 9 percent of the total land area of the Hawaiian Islands and 15¼ percent of all the privately owned land, about 370,000 acres. Mrs. Bishop was a descendant of the Hawaiian royal family and acquired these vast holdings by royal will 2 years prior to her death;

Second, and also Hawaiian, is Richard Smart, proprietor of world-famous Parker ranch which embraces 339,472 acres, which is 8 percent

of the Territory's total land area and 14 percent of all privately owned land;

Third, which is non-Hawaiian, is the Gay and Robinson combine which besides owning outright the island of Niihau also owns 55,446 acres on the island of Kauai;

Fourth, also non-Hawaiian, is the Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Ltd., whose holdings include the entire island of Lanai, and yesterday Mr. White, its president, appeared before you.

Fifth, and the third Hawaiian estate among the top five, are the heirs of the James Campbell estate who own 91,204 acres. Mrs. Campbell, the heir of this estate, is a member of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, a member of the board of which Mr. Houston is chairman.

The estate of John Ii, a Hawaiian, owns 19,643 acres on the Island of Oahu, nearly 6 percent of that congested island's total land area. Another is the Queen Emma estate. Still others are the estates of M. P. Robinson, Mary E. Foster, R. W. Meyer, Ltd., and Robert Hind, Ltd.

A recent estimate by the Bureau of Vital Statistics of the Territorial Board of Health of 1949 sets the number of pure Hawaiians in the Territory at 10,761 and the number of Part-Hawaiians at 67,082, a total of 77,843 representing 14.8 percent of the total population of 519,503.

In its report to the 1949 regular session of the Hawaiian Legislature, after almost 30 years of operation, with 169,384 acres at its exclusive disposal, listing assets and capital outlays totaling \$4,695,943.17, the Hawaiian Homes Commission was able to show less than 8,000 acres under lease to 1,119 individuals of 50 percent or Hawaiian blood. If you want to get the figures, I secured this from the report of the Commission, but you will have to do a lot of adding, because they have not added it up.

Moreover, these 1,119 homesteads and house lots are situated on the 8,000 most arid, most rocky, most unproductive acres among the 169,384 reserved to the Hawaiian Homes Commission.

The HHC report also stated that, including families of lessees, the total number of Hawaiians and part Hawaiians residing on HHC land was 5,373. This is less than 7 percent of the Territory's Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian population.

It is barely 1 percent of Hawaii's total population.

But let us for a moment turn from icy facts and statistics and look at the more human side of the story as it relates to these Hawaiians whose "conditions" the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act presumes and pretends to "better."

There is real pathos in the cases of the homesteaders who, before or after the grant of the homestead lease, contract a marriage with a person either of a different race or whose Hawaiian ancestry is widely diffused with that of other races, rendering the child or children of the marriage ineligible to succeed to the parent's interest in that long lease that passes so far the span of one lifetime. To the children of that marriage, the leasehold property is no less endeared by association as a home than to the more fortunate children of other homesteaders.

Even more tragic, if that is possible, are those cases where a homesteader has been twice married, the children of one marriage having the blood requirement of the act, the children of the other marriage

missing it by a very small fraction. Discriminating against the innocent, creating dissension and strife under one roof, there can hardly be a more brutal injustice.

Perhaps the sponsor of this legislation would argue that these home-steaders should protect the purity of their Hawaiian blood and not intermingle it with others. I reject such an argument, and I know you gentlemen do, just as the Hawaiians by action have so eloquently rejected it, as opposed to all we hope for.

Of all that I may say here today, it is this which I hope will be remembered longest: The strength and the riches of the future Hawaii will be not in the plantations of cane and pineapples, but in the new race we in Hawaii are creating from the mingled bloods of many lands, inheriting the charm and grace of old Hawaii, the patience and the stamina of the Orient, the mechanical and the genius of the Occident.

In that, believe me, lies the bright and shining hope and the greatness of Hawaii.

Until and unless you gentlemen amend or reject it, H. R. 49 would require that we enter into a pact that not only would sanction race discrimination, but which would keep our people, our legislatures, and our future constitutional conventions in tutelage to Congress, forbidding us to change without the approval of Congress the major provisions of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act—while compelling us to administer it. And this not only would make of us a second-class State instead of a Territory with second-class citizens, but would raise nice legal questions apparent to every lawyer present here today.

We would continue to be treated to the painful spectacle of a fat bureaucracy deceiving and betraying 15 percent of our population at the expense of 100 percent of the population while, to heap insult upon injury, it is smugly ensconced within the constitutional law of the land entirely beyond reach or influence of its victims.

Therefore, pertinent to this proposal which by coercion would make the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 a part of any constitution for a State of Hawaii, I respectfully submit these to be the irrefutable facts:

(1) The Hawaiian Homes Commission, created a multi-million-dollar Government bureau and allotted 169,384 precious acres of land by amendment to the Hawaiian Organic Act in 1920, never was justified to begin with when, then as now, virtually half of the Territory's privately owned land was possessed by persons of Hawaiian racial descent.

At this point I would like to submit this exhibit showing land ownership for your committee. You will find the same chart in this little booklet, "Everybody Loves the Hawaiians."

(2) Its needlessness is eloquently illustrated by the fact that, after 30 years, it has been able to induce only 1,119 families to occupy less than 8,000 acres of land and these families, with a total population of 5,373 persons, constitute less than 7 percent of Hawaii's rapidly diminishing native population.

At this point I would like to submit this exhibit, showing the comparative differential between the areas that now occupy them and those that do not.

(The document was filed with the committee.)

Mr. NOBRIGA. (3) It is a further travesty of its purpose to help the Hawaiians by virtue of the fact that, upon the death of each lessee,

the land together with all improvements reverts to the Hawaiian Homes Commission without equity to heirs and survivors.

I have now a letter which I would like to submit as Exhibit 3. This letter was written to Delegate Joseph Farrington by a Mrs. McAngus from Molokai, stressing the very point that I have made to the committee that the Hawaiians are generally disappearing and there will be nobody left within a short period of time. I have photostatic copies.

(Copy of letter follows:)

HOOLEHUA, MOLOKAI,
November 28, 1949.

MR. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON,
Delegate to Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FARRINGTON: I hold a lease and live on homestead No. 68 at Hoolehua, Molokai and have resided there for a period of over 25 years. I have been able by farming the property to make a living but have been compelled at times to secure financial assistance from my daughter, Mrs. Henry Cobb-Adams.

I have now reached the age where it is difficult for me to do the hard work necessary to cultivate my homestead and my son-in-law, Mr. Henry Cobb-Adams has kindly agreed to come to Molokai to assist in the required work.

My age has caused me to view with some concern the future ownership of my homestead. My daughter having assisted financially in my operations, I feel she and her husband should logically own the farm in case of my death and I desire that this be accomplished if possible. The difficulty is however, that under the conditions of ownership as I understand it, one must be 50 percent or more Hawaiian and my daughter and her husband are only 25 percent Hawaiian. I understand several of the homesteaders will have the same difficulty and this letter is written with the thought in mind that you assist in having the regulations modified in order that persons of less than 50 percent Hawaiian may inherit homesteads at Hoolehua.

Any assistance you may be able to give in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Very sincerely yours,

Mrs. DORA B. McANGUS.

Mr. NOBRIGA. (4) The Hawaiians are the most assimilative racial group in Hawaii. For example, last year there were only 28 marriages between Hawaiians while there were 520 marriages between Part-Hawaiians and members of non-Hawaiian races, and Hawaii's Bureau of Vital Statistics estimates that 87 years from now not a single person of 50 percent or more Hawaiian blood will be surviving.

I have a chart here figured out to show how we have arrived at these figures, which is exhibit 4.

(The document was filed with the committee.)

Mr. NOBRIGA. (5) In this area where tillable and inhabitable land for ownership is at a premium as high as anywhere in the world, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is denying to Hawaii's entire population, including native Hawaiians of every degree of blood, the right to ownership of 169,384 acres.

I have exhibit 5, it shows the whole Territory of Hawaii. The light territory shows the part set aside for the Hawaiian Homes Commission, and the shaded those areas occupied to date, in 30 years.

(The document was filed with the committee.)

Mr. NOBRIGA. The Hawaiian Homes Commission is an abominable act.

It is sheer effontery, not only to the people of Hawaii but to the body of Congress, that H. R. 49 should have been written to make

statehood contingent upon the people's acquiescence to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

The disposition that must be made of the Hawaiian homelands, one way or another, clearly is not one for treatment in the basic law of the State but in the statutory codes that will follow by legislative action.

The real obligation to the 1,119 lessees of Hawaiian homelands is that of preserving to them the land which they properly have come to think of as their own and granting to them the fee-simple title to these leaseholds. This I stand for, categorically and unequivocally, and have pledged myself to work for.

But, before this can be done, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act must be stricken from the law wherever it appears, and I have reference to House Resolution 49.

I pray, humbly and sincerely, that each of you gentlemen will realize that the future economic prosperity of all the people of Hawaii—and their right to the pursuit of happiness—demand the amendment of H. R. 49, now before you, to delete all provisions pertaining to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Cordon?

Senator CORDON. I have a few questions. What is your view, sir, as to whether whatever might be the constitutional questions involved there is a definite question of injustice involved in the use of a definition of the term "native Hawaiian" as being one of at least 50-percent Hawaiian blood?

Mr. NOBRIGA. I am not a lawyer, Senator Cordon.

Senator CORDON. I excused you from answering the legal part of it. I assumed that we were not going into the constitutional matter. I asked you for your view as to the equity of it. Is it a sound thing to do?

Mr. NOBRIGA. I do not think it is. If I may illustrate it with a concrete example, we have found that if you think in terms of the land as to its best usage, in order to strengthen our economy, the Hawaiian Homes Commission now has been detrimental to the program, even in our program there to alleviate the unemployment situation.

Senator CORDON. Is it not the basic philosophy of this act that of an assumption that those of 50 percent or more Hawaiian blood are incapable of handling their own affairs and must have a guardian?

Mr. NOBRIGA. I do not think that is the right approach to the problem.

Senator CORDON. Is not that the basic philosophy of it?

Mr. NOBRIGA. It is just a sentimental approach.

Senator CORDON. I do not see too much sentiment in it.

Mr. NOBRIGA. As I see it, it is just sentiment against settlement.

Senator CORDON. How long have you lived in Hawaii?

Mr. NOBRIGA. Forty-four years. I was born and raised there.

Senator CORDON. And, in your view of the Hawaiian people who are 50 percent of Hawaiian blood, are they any less able to take care of themselves than are those of 25 percent or 40 percent?

Mr. NOBRIGA. No, sir. You have some pure Hawaiians who are very capable of taking care of themselves. They are no different than any other racial group in Hawaii.

Senator CORDON. Let us get to a practical question. I understand from the testimony that there are somewhere between 1,100 and 1,300 Hawaiian homes—commission homesteads—now occupied by the beneficiaries under the law. Do you know why, in this period of some thirty-odd years, that only that number of Hawaiians have been able to secure the homestead?

Mr. NOBRIGA. I do not know the inside machinery, but may I state this, Senator Cordon: There has been mentioned—I have no evidence to substantiate this—that the original intent of the Hawaiian Homes Commission was not really to help the Hawaiians, but it was to protect certain areas of cane land in the Territory for the big plantation interests.

You find that in 1920, at the time of the enactment of this act, that an amendment was made to the organic act, where you had 25 applicants to homesteads in certain governmental areas, that it was not applicable to cane land. It was changed at the same time. I understand that there was quite a movement in those days to homestead certain plantation lands, and therefore this was brought about.

Senator CORDON. Do you know why action has not been had to settle more of the folks on the land? If you do not know any of the facts, say so and we will try to find somebody who does.

Mr. NOBRIGA. These lands were turned over to the Territory of Hawaii, the commission of public lands, and it in turn would be leased to the public. Large portions of these areas were leased for 21 years. There is a possibility that some of those lands could not be made available to the Hawaiians.

Senator CORDON. No possibility under the law. The law requires that if the lands be not used by this commission, the commission may turn the lands back to the commission, but the commission must so lease them that they can be returned to this commission when they need them.

Mr. NOBRIGA. Before they leased the land out, they could have done that. But after they lease it they have to wait 21 years.

Senator CORDON. Is that the only reason so far as you know that the lands have not gone into appropriate leaseholds by those for whom the law was passed?

Mr. NOBRIGA. That is right.

Senator CORDON. Mr. Chairman, I believe that it would pay us at this time to get to the bottom of this which seems to be one of the real questions where our friends from Hawaii are some way divided among themselves.

I would like to get to the bottom of it now, even though it may take a little time which we could use for other matters.

Senator TAYLOR (now presiding). This seems to be the most important part of the statehood bill, the part in controversy.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I can answer briefly some of the points that have been raised, and then I would like to ask Mr. King to expand on them.

I want to say at the very outset that while this may be controversial, it is the only feature of the bill that is controversial. I do not believe there is another person in this room that supports the position taken by Senator Nobriga. If there is, or if there is anybody in our legislature who does, I would like to hear from them now. Senator

Nobriga represents a very small but aggressive group of people who are opposed to the Hawaiian home project and want to liquidate it.

I want to say that it is my belief that the great majority of the people in Hawaii are in favor of it. They want to place this provision in this bill so that its position will be doubly secure. I recognize the validity of the point you make when you ask why we ask to be a State, then suggest certain safeguards be placed in our constitution to protect the Hawaiians. I recognize that is a very valid point. But our reason for making this request is that we want the future of this project to be doubly secure; we want to reassure the Hawaiians, who now feel that they have a great sense of security, that they can continue to enjoy this security under State government.

Senator CORDON. Do you feel that they gain that security if after about thirty-odd years only about 1,000 are gaining any advantage out of it?

Mr. FARRINGTON. The answer to that is that the Hawaiian Homes Commission has not had the funds necessary to develop on a broader basis. I certainly would have liked to have seen it developed more rapidly. But the progress it has made so far is very gratifying indeed; it has only begun to indicate what can really be done.

Senator CORDON. Is the lack of wider leasing of the area used due solely to lack of finances?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I think it is principally that, and principally the lack of aggressiveness on the part of some of those who have been responsible for the administration of this project.

Senator CORDON. Do you believe, Mr. Farrington, that this is sound legislation for Hawaii?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I most emphatically do, Senator Cordon. I say to you that, on the basis of what I have observed in American Samoa and in other areas where the native people, the aborigines, live, that it is completely sound.

I recall very distinctly the testimony that the late Judge A. G. M. Robertson gave to the joint congressional committee in 1937. He was one of the great authorities on the land laws of the Territory. He said one great mistake made in the original division of land in Hawaii was made in giving the common people, so-called, title in fee to their land, because, having been raised under a feudal system as former Delegate Houston explains, they were not accustomed to landownership and did not understand its responsibilities, and they were consequently dispossessed of a large part of it. This law is an attempt in part to correct that error.

You will find when you come to consideration of an organic law for Samoa that the problem will present itself as one of the basic questions to be settled; the question of whether or not the Matai system, under which land is held and occupied in Samoa, should be abandoned.

The native people of Hawaii were not raised under the same conditions that we were. I think and I think most people in Hawaii feel that certain safeguards should be provided them in their landholdings; that they should be protected from attempts to take their lands from them.

Senator CORDON. For the first time you are causing me to wonder whether I am right in my judgment about this whole problem. I cannot follow the reason of one who says at one time that the people

of Hawaii, all of them, are politically mature, self-sufficient, able to carry on all of the responsibilities of self-government, and says at the same time that they are not able even to understand the meaning of land titles nor to protect their own personal interests in them. The two views to me are diametrically opposed.

Mr. FARRINGTON. My answer to that, Senator Cordon, is that you did not correctly state my position. I did not say that the people of Hawaii did not understand the responsibilities of landownership. I said that the native Hawaiian people, who constitute a very small minority by reason of their not having had the experience that we have had, are entitled to certain safeguards in the ownership of their lands.

And that proposes something no different from what we have done for aboriginal people within the continental land of the United States.

Senator CORDON. I think we made a mistake there, too.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Possibly we did, but I do not say this project should be liquidated. I think the base for this is quite different. The distinguishing feature of the Hawaiian project is that the people involved are on the land under 99-year leases. They are completely free otherwise. They are not on reservations. They are not denied citizenship. They are not set apart from the rest. Only in land tenure, they enjoy certain safeguards.

They constitute a minority and a decreasing minority. And so long as they continue to be with us I think that we can well afford to say that we will hold this much of the land which was once theirs for their exclusive benefit, and surround it with certain safeguards so that they can be perpetuated, so far as it is possible for them to be perpetuated.

It is a special arrangement to deal with a special problem. I think it is another evidence of the genius of Hawaii in developing original plans to contend with special problems—its own problem.

Senator CORDON. Let me see if I can follow you. I want to. Your view is that, as to that segment of your population which is of 50-or-more-percent Hawaiian blood, they need protection of their government to a greater degree than do the balance?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes, sir.

Senator CORDON. That is No. 1 postulate, and the very base of your view.

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is correct. Nothing compulsory about that, Senator; that is only for those who want to take advantage of that refuge, so to speak.

Senator CORDON. Again, are we not somewhat illogical? It has always been my experience that those who need the help the most are apt to be the last to ask for it, because sometimes they do not even realize they can get it.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I do not disagree on that. I add only that we have tried progressively to try to pull the native Hawaiians out of the terement districts.

Senator CORDON. Is your view that if, as, and when there shall not be in Hawaii any more Hawaiians of 50-percent Hawaiian blood this particular venture will end?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I do not think it is for us to answer that question. I don't think you can answer that now. We can cross that bridge when we come to it.

Senator CORDON. I do not like to legislate on that basis. I think when you pass a law you should know what you are doing, and you should follow it through to its ultimate conclusion. That would, in any event, be the net result, would it not? The commission would have nothing to do when there was left in Hawaii none of at least 50-percent Hawaiian blood.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I will answer that by saying that this question as to the content, the amount of Hawaiian blood of those who occupy the land, is a question which has received a great deal of attention and, frankly, has been very perplexing to those who have been responsible for the administration of this law.

We have cases of half-Hawaiians who settled on the land and married into other races and have children who are only a quarter-Hawaiian. No one wants to displace them. There is some disagreement and uncertainty as to how they should be dealt with. I do not think personally it is possible to reach a final determination on this question at the present time. We might be able to do so in another 20 years, maybe another 50 years.

Senator CORDON. How many of your population are 50 percent or more of Hawaiian blood?

Mr. FARRINGTON. We have no exact figures on that.

Senator CORDON. You must have an estimate.

Mr. FARRINGTON. About 30,000, pure Hawaiians and half-Hawaiians, men, women, and children.

Senator CORDON. I noticed from what showing is made in these exhibits which have been presented to me that most of the areas which are available for this commission—that is, in volume—are on the Island of Kauai, on Molakai, and, to a lesser degree, Hawaii and Maui, with very little on the Island of Oahu, which is the most populous of the Islands.

Is that because when the act was passed there was no land available in adequate amounts on Oahu?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes. The reason for that was that there was relatively little land available for that purpose on Oahu. They took public lands and set it aside for this purpose.

Senator CORDON. That is what I intended to convey in my question: That there was not available the necessary lands on the Island of Oahu.

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is correct.

Senator CORDON. What has been the experience of the commission with respect to eligible Hawaiians, resident on Oahu, going to the other islands in order to get the benefit of the act?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I think Mr. Houston might answer that question if he has not already answered to it.

Mr. HOUSTON. We tried that, and there is no disposition to want to leave the centers of industry to go to an outlying district where employment is difficult. Unemployment is already a very difficult problem. And to go to an outlying island like Hawaii or Kauai or Maui would only embarrass them in seeking work. The reason those other islands have not been opened up was financial, as indicated by the Delegate, and lack of water, even on Molokai, where the principal project was originally allocated.

The great problem has been due to lack of water. Sometimes for months during the dry season they did not even have enough water for household consumption.

Senator CORDON. That indicates to me that the law is not answering its purpose.

Mr. HOUSTON. We took the best land that was given us and are trying to do the best we can with it. If there had been better land given to us, as was indicated in answer to your question—there was no land available on Oahu other than the few parcels that they have given us.

Senator CORDON. If the act is crippled in that respect, or in any others, I wonder if this is not the time to inquire into it and to find some kind of corrective surgery?

Mr. HOUSTON. May I say that, difficult as the problem is, it is meeting a very decided need. I say, also, successfully, because I point to the improvement of the racial make-up from a low of 37,000 in round figures to 85,000 at the present time.

Senator CORDON. You cannot ascribe that increase to the fact that there are 1,000 people on some of these little leaseholds?

Mr. HOUSTON. We do not claim it. But the whole picture has been encouraging to the Hawaiians.

Senator CORDON. If we are going to report out a statehood bill, I would like to report out the best one that we can.

Mr. FARRINGTON. May I add some comments, Senator?

Senator CORDON. I would be happy to hear you.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take over this meeting.

Senator TAYLOR. Go right ahead. I think it is a very important question.

Mr. FARRINGTON. The purpose of the Hawaiian homes proposal of this bill is not to alter or change the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, but to continue it because it is the belief of the majority of our people that it has demonstrated its value and usefulness. It is in this act because it came into being originally as the result of enactment of a law by Congress. This action was taken in recognition of the fact that the Federal Government itself has an obligation to assist in the rehabilitation of the native Hawaiian people. The native Hawaiians have always looked to Uncle Sam as a protector and guardian.

You refer to the fact that not many of the Hawaiians have been moved to the other islands. That is very true. We have learned a lot by experience.

Senator CORDON. My question was, rather, as to whether or not they were voluntarily willing to go?

Mr. FARRINGTON. No; they are not. Experience has demonstrated that we cannot change their way of life; that they are not prepared to move out and become farmers.

But when they are offered an opportunity to establish themselves in nice homes they will move out of the tenement districts and continue their normal occupations. That is what is happening in Honolulu, where you find many Hawaiians employed as stevedores, lei sellers and holding many other similar positions.

They live under very favorable conditions in sharp contrast to what they were doing before they moved into Hawaiian Homes Commission homes. That is also true in Hilo, where they have opened what

are called house lots. Experience has demonstrated that this method offers an unusually effective way to ease their condition and contribute to the solution of their housing problem.

Senator CORDON. Does the Hawaiian Homes Commission handle that?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes; they have been handling that. You may recall in Honolulu the area called Papakolea. That has been expanded very considerably since the war. A nice community is developing there. It has done an awful lot to lift the general standard of some of the Hawaiian people.

Senator CORDON. Do you not think that psychologically you might perhaps have a better act if your Hawaiian Homes Act, provided that, while initially the recipient must be of one-half Hawaiian blood, the leasehold, which after a family has occupied it about so long ceases to be a leasehold and becomes a home with all the sentimental attachments that go with it, might pass by inheritance to the children of the individual who originally was eligible, even though the children might be of less blood than initially?

Mr. FARRINGTON. There is considerable thinking along that line. The proposal has been made that they be given fee-simple title to this property. Most of those who studied the history of the Hawaiians and this problem feel that we are not quite ready for that. It may be in another 10 or 20 years that we will be.

Senator CORDON. Do you believe that the State of Hawaii would be competent to answer this problem for itself?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I most certainly do, Senator. I know very readily what your reply might be to that: Why do you want it in this particular legislation?

Senator CORDON. My question was going to be: Do you want it in here?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes, I want it in there.

Senator CORDON. Now, the question is: Why?

Mr. FARRINGTON. There are certain of us who as long as we are in public life will be out fighting for this. I think we have enough strength to protect it now. But we want this provision incorporated in this law as assurance that the Federal Government's interest will be continued, so the Hawaiians will feel that beyond Hawaii, back here in Washington, the Great White Father will always be looking out for them. I say this even though I must confess, after having worked in Washington for many years, that I am not so sure that they are going to get any better treatment from the Great White Father than they are from their own people right at home.

Senator CORDON. Neither am I. I have some questions in mind about this. Let me turn to something else that ties in with the same thing, Mr. Farrington.

On page 12 of H. R. 49, paragraph (c), it provides:

The State of Hawaii, upon its admission to the Union, shall be entitled to select, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue patents to said State for 180,000 acres of public lands, as that term is defined in section 73 (a) of the Hawaiian Organic Act (42 Stat. 116, 48 U. S. C., sec. 663), within the boundaries of said State. The selection of such lands by the State of Hawaii shall be made and completed within 5 years from the admission of said State into the Union. The lands so selected shall be in lieu of any and all grants provided for new States by provisions of law other than this act, and such grants shall not extend to the State of Hawaii.

(d) The lands patented to the State of Hawaii pursuant to the preceding subsection, together with the proceeds thereof and the income therefrom, shall be held by said State as a public trust for the support of the public schools and other public educational institutions, for the betterment of the conditions of native Hawaiians, as defined in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, for the development of farm and home ownership on as widespread a basis as possible, and for the making of public improvements.

I call your attention to that language found on page 13, lines 4 and 5, "for the betterment of the native Hawaiians as defined in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended."

That reads into this admission act the definition of native Hawaiians that appears in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act and extends this additional benefit to that particular class of your citizens, does it not?

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is right.

Senator CORDON. Is that necessary or proper, in view of the special consideration that is given under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act?

Mr. FARRINGTON. All it does is to make this project eligible for the benefits of the receipts to be realized from this land. That is a very broad provision. The lands that would fall within that category are for the most part the revenue-producing lands of the Territory which yield, I believe, about a million dollars a year.

That money goes into the general revenues of the Territory and the provision for the disposition of that money is extremely broad. It specifically qualifies this project for that money.

The reason for tying the Hawaiian Homes Commission project into the receipts from the lands is the very strong feeling that you find in Hawaii that the Hawaiians did not do so well when the land was divided in the "great mahele" of 1848. And that feeling is particularly among the Hawaiians themselves. After all, they have something of a prior consideration as to the use of the receipts of the land.

Senator CORDON. Was it the intention of those who support this bill that that language should actually, as a mandatory proposition, give anything to the native Hawaiians?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I do not think there is anything mandatory about it, Senator.

Senator CORDON. I cannot find it if there is. I am wondering if it is not some brand of java wash. To me it is utter surplusage, Mr. Farrington, because you have first the use of the proceeds for the support of public schools and other educational institutions, with no requirement as to what portion, any portion or all; or for the betterment of the conditions of the native Hawaiians, or any portion or all, or none; for the development of farm and home ownership on as widespread a basis as possible, any part of it, all of it, or none; and for making public improvements with the same lack of qualification.

Mr. FARRINGTON. We of Hawaii never lose an opportunity to pay tribute to the Hawaiian tradition. It is an important part of our life. Maybe this is another expression of it. In our election we use Hawaiian equivalents to our names. In many other ways we recognize the contribution of the Hawaiians to our way of life. We have derived much of our basic thinking on human relations from them. We like to acknowledge this.

Senator CORDON. The next sentence of that section tosses into the new State either by virtue of constitution provision, if you have it

in your constitution, or by statutory enactment after you become a State, sole authority to disburse the funds for any of these purposes but not otherwise.

I hope if there are any suggestions to be made by anybody with reference to this Home Commissions Act that the committee can receive them. Personally I should like to consider them at the time that we consider our action in executive session, Mr. Chairman.

I think that there is nothing further on this subject except that I am not satisfied that the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act is doing the job it was intended to do. I would like to do something to make it do it.

I agree with the Delegate when he suggests that there is a feeling that perhaps the Hawaiians have not been wholly justly dealt with here. I have that feeling. The so-called public lands, which under this proposed admission act would have title to remain in the United States for a period of 5 years, at which time it would go to Hawaii if no action were taken, those lands are in no sense public lands as that term is understood in the United States.

They were initially crown lands, and went from the status of crown ownership into that of public ownership of a republic which succeeded the monarchy. From my viewpoint the United States of America has not any interest in them whatever, except to transmit them to the people of Hawaii.

If I could transmit a part of them and get a good job for the Hawaiians of Hawaii I would like to do it.

Mr. FARRINGTON. We hope that you, after this bill is enacted into law—which we hope it is—will be on that joint committee.

Mr. Chairman, at the conclusion of Mr. Nobriga's testimony I would like to ask that Mr. King be heard on the subject, very briefly.

Senator TAYLOR. That will be all right.

You mentioned this housing development. This is for Hawaiians, 50-percent blood or more only?

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is right. That is the definition they thought was best adapted to that problem.

Senator TAYLOR. Will that create a tendency there toward segregation, eventually?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Not the slightest.

Senator TAYLOR. You do not think that they will get to be people apart in keeping them off to themselves?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I am sure, Senator, if we could transport you to Hawaii for 24 hours you would be satisfied that the likelihood of segregation in Hawaii is about as remote as anything possibly could be.

Senator TAYLOR. Mr. Nobriga?

Mr. NOBRIGA. I would like to state that I agree, it seems to be very apparent, the inconsistency of our argument in that we are well qualified to handle this problem on the one hand and that we are not on the other.

There have been two proposals submitted in the convention now in session in Honolulu that make an attempt to legislate against the Hawaiian Homes Commission, but they cannot, because if this is made a provision of the enabling act it is a mandate upon the people of Hawaii.

It is my feeling all the time that the people of Hawaii, the legislature, and those delegates to the convention are qualified to handle this problem.

May I state this further: If Delegate Farrington and the proponents of the Hawaiian Homes Commission feel that the majority of the people of Hawaii support this idea, then he should be assured that the legislature and the people down there will do right by the Hawaiians in accordance with their proposals. So I do not see any dangers.

Senator ECTON. I would like to ask a question.

Senator TAYLOR. Certainly, Senator.

Senator ECTON. What would be the matter, Mr. Nobriga, with permitting the native Hawaiians, if they want to take special care of them—and I presume that is the special purpose of this Hawaiian Homes Commission—why not permit the native Hawaiians to homestead this land set up by this Commission, or give them and their descendants the land in fee, if they are already on there and could qualify. Then they would own it and you would get rid of it and you would not have this class distinction.

That would automatically solve the whole problem.

Mr. NOBRIGA. That is true. I agree with you.

Senator ECTON. What is wrong with that?

Mr. NOBRIGA. Nothing. They have 169,000 acres they cannot utilize. They have not the facility or know-how.

Senator ECTON. Whether they have the know-how or not, they would have the right to settle it and own it if they wanted to.

Mr. NOBRIGA. There is nothing wrong with that. If we could allot to them a certain part of the land they could use, homestead, and the rest of the area available to the people so they could put it to work, that is all right, there is nothing wrong with that. I cannot see anything wrong with that.

Senator ECTON. I was interested in this letter that you presented, purportedly addressed to Mr. Farrington. In reading this letter, I understand that this woman has the lease on this property and when she dies then her daughter cannot continue to live on the land simply because she is not 50 percent of Hawaiian blood; is that correct?

Mr. NOBRIGA. That is correct. Absolutely correct. That is right.

Senator ECTON. Yet I understand that the purpose of the act is not only to help these Hawaiians but also to get them out of these congested districts and get them out on the land. Here is a girl whose mother is a Hawaiian and she is at least 25 percent Hawaiian, and she wants to live on the land. Yet she will not be permitted to, under this Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. Is that correct?

Mr. NOBRIGA. That is correct.

Senator ECTON. I do not like it. I personally would be perfectly willing, if Hawaii becomes a State, to permit them to go ahead and legislate on it and settle the question. If it is true, as you state, that if it is in this enabling act, then the future Hawaiian in State legislatures will be duty-bound to respect this as a mandate. It seems to me that this committee should go into it at this time and give it consideration and attempt to fix it so that the State of Hawaii in the future can handle it if we cannot dispose of it here.

I think it would be most unfortunate if this committee and the Congress would do something here to bind the State of Hawaii for all

time to something that might be embarrassing to everybody concerned in the future.

Mr. NOBRIGA. Conditions are rapidly changing. The people in Hawaii know their problems. I feel that it should be their responsibility to make these adjustments, that it has absolutely no place in a basic law.

In the first place, it is discriminatory, and there is no place whatsoever in the basic law of the land. Therefore, as I have recommended, I trust that you will consider the repeal of this provision from the enabling act, H. R. 49.

Senator TAYLOR. Mr. Nobriga, reference was made to the small group you represent. Could you tell us who this group is, if they have any special interests?

Mr. NOBRIGA. I would be very happy to. May I state this before I answer your question directly?

Senator TAYLOR. Go ahead.

Mr. NOBRIGA. In Hawaii we have a powerful minority group. That is influenced in a large measure by those of Hawaiian extraction, and it so happens that the proponents of the Hawaiian Homes Commission are in key positions, if you will notice in the delegation here. Therefore, they exert a powerful influence in certain decisions that are made. They are not too consistent sometimes.

I therefore say that when Delegate Farrington stated that the majority of the people in Hawaii favor this, I challenge him, and I say they do not. And even some of the delegation who came over here with us today do not agree.

May I read a paragraph from the Honolulu paper—owned by Delegate Farrington—dated April 28? It says, however, several Members pointed out that they were voting in favor of retaining this provision in House Resolution 49 “only because the argument in Washington might jeopardize statehood and not because they feel Senator Nobriga is wrong.”

I want to point this out, and I have confidence in this committee, that this has nothing to do whatsoever with the passage of the Statehood Enabling Act. I believe we should have statehood, and that we are qualified and we are ready. But we should make certain adjustments.

Senator ECTON. We should never be so anxious to gain any end that we trade off our birthright, so to speak. We should try to fix it, or at least consider fixing it, at this time. I think you do a good service to call it to the attention of the committee.

Mr. NOBRIGA. Thank you.

Senator TAYLOR. At this stage of the proceedings, with the argument certainly in the open here, and with the considerable interest which appears to be evident by most members of the committee, anybody who in the past has felt reticent to discuss it should not feel that way now. It is here; it is not under the table. It is going to be gone into thoroughly, I warrant you.

Whether anybody is for it or against it will not influence the matter of statehood because it is a question that must be decided.

So I say to anyone who has anything to say against it that they might as well speak up and try to clarify the questions about this matter in the minds of the members of the committee.

Have you anything further to say, Mr. Nobriga?

Mr. NOBRIGA. No, sir.

Senator ECTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make another comment. It is my opinion that any amendment to this legislation, or any legislation, does not jeopardize that legislation if that amendment has merit and is justified and seems to be fair and reasonable. I think it is a false notion that you must not do this or you must not do that, that you must not dot the "i" or cross a "t" for fear it will jeopardize legislation.

My experience has been that, if an idea has merit and it is proposed as an amendment, it will not jeopardize legislation.

Senator TAYLOR. Before Mr. Nobriga leaves the witness stand: Delegate Farrington, you referred to a small group that Mr. Nobriga represented. Could you elaborate on that? It has aroused my curiosity.

Mr. FARRINGTON. My understanding is that this amendment is supported by—there is no secret about it—an organization called the Hawaii Small Ranchers' Association.

I believe the members of that organization are entirely on the island of Hawaii. They have been in correspondence with me and disagreed with the position I have taken on this in a very frank and friendly disagreement. The president is Daniel Correa; vice president, John Ramos; secretary, Alfred Andrade; treasurer, Jack Ramos; and the directors: Antone Fereira, K. Ishimine, Richard Jose, Aldred Menino, and W. J. Nobriga.

They are, as I understand it, the cattlemen and small farmers in east Hawaii.

Mr. NOBRIGA. These are the small ranchers' association.

Mr. FARRINGTON. There are other farmers in the Kamuela area, a plateau on Hawaii island, who are interested in an irrigation project to develop land up there. A considerable portion of it is Hawaiian Homes Commission land.

It was proposed that that land be made available to farmers who are not Hawaiians. A very considerable controversy developed over it.

It is a subject that received widespread discussion in the Territory itself. It was a point of very active controversy. There is nothing to prevent these issues being resolved under the provisions of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act as it now stands. The amendment in the bill merely perpetuates the arrangement that we have at the present time, even if the State of Hawaii enters into a compact with the United States Government, the law continues to be a Federal law and can be amended by an act of Congress.

Senator ECTON. The mandate you do not consider necessarily constitutes a mandate on all future legislatures in the State of Hawaii?

Mr. FARRINGTON. No. It means the State of Hawaii cannot alter it without the approval of Congress. That is the practical result. In other words, there is a safeguard with congressional approval back of it.

Senator ECTON. Of course, if this Homes Commission is a Federal agency, which it is—is it not?

Mr. FARRINGTON. No, sir; it is a Territorial agency, set up under Federal law.

Senator ECTON. Yet it is not a Federal agency?

Mr. FARRINGTON. No, sir.

Senator ECTON. It is within the Territory of Hawaii now?

Mr. FARRINGTON. It reflects that unique arrangement under which the lands of Hawaii are administered.

Senator ECTON. So that Congress would not be called upon to abolish the Hawaiian Homes Commission; they would only have to sanction what the desires of the State legislature might be in regard to it? Is that correct?

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is correct. There is nothing to prevent—

Senator ECTON. That is a little different than if it were a Territorial agency. I was going to say if it were a Territorial agency, you know, Congress could not abolish any Territorial agency.

Mr. FARRINGTON. My feeling about it is that these issues ought to be fought out in Hawaii and then carried to Congress, where they can be finally resolved. It is entirely legitimate for purposes of this legislation to perpetuate that arrangement. So that the Hawaiians may feel that they have the additional safeguard of congressional veto, so to speak.

Senator TAYLOR. Mr. Nobriga?

Mr. NOBRIGA. Mr. Chairman, this is a picture of Judge Irwin, who drafted the original Hawaiian Homes Commission Act in 1920. On December 4, 1949, just 4 or 5 months ago, he made a statement to the papers. It is very interesting, what he said. The gist of it is that possibly we have now come to a time when we should make a change. Conditions are a little bit different now than they were 30 years ago. If you wish, I would be very happy to leave this with the committee as exhibit 6.

Senator TAYLOR. We will put it right in the record if it is pertinent to this matter.

(The document is as follows:)

[Hilo Tribune Herald, December 4, 1949]

T. H. LAND LAWS BECOME HOTTEST STATEHOOD ISSUE

(By Harry Blickhahn)

Hawaii's land laws bid fair to become the sharpest issue of all at the forthcoming state constitutional convention.

Although Delegate Farrington's measure setting up a Hawaii statehood enabling act—a measure still very much alive in Congress—incorporates the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act as a basic part of the law of the new State, the issue has arisen more sharply than ever before because of two factors, both of them reflecting the importance of the Big Island in the statehood picture.

They are:

(1) The proposed Federal reclamation service irrigation project in the rich and broad Waimea Valley.

(2) The fact that long-term leases of Hawaiian Homes Commission lands in this area, previously held chiefly by the large ranching interests, are expiring within the next year.

Since the problem of making the best use of these lands in the future must be settled, and the problem of this settlement, comes at a time when a constitution for the new State is being drawn, the two become inextricably involved.

There is further complexity in the fact that the act set up to provide for the security of the Hawaiian people may be at stake.

There are also these complications:

The Hawaiians, good fishermen, good ranchers, and good workmen though they may be, are not good truck gardeners.

The Homes Commission lands involved in the dispute provide some of the best soil in the Territory for truck farming, and under irrigation could probably feed the whole Territory, creating vast new wealth on an island where it is badly needed.

Sponsors of the irrigation project tried to win approval of the Homes Commission by naming the HHC executive officer one of the three permanent administrators of the irrigation project, by giving Hawaiians first choice of leases and by providing that the lands would revert to the HHC after the reclamation loan is paid off to the Federal Government.

But the Hawaiians were not and still are not convinced that they would not, in the end, lose their Waimea lands. Furthermore, the leases, as set up in the irrigation proposal, are designed for truck farming in which they have no interest, and are too small for individual ranching enterprise.

Judge Harry Irwin, of Hilo, who was attorney general of the Territory at the time the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act was made a part of the Territorial Organic Act by Congress in 1921, drafted the original version of the act himself, at the direction of the 1919 legislature.

Its objective was "to bring about the rehabilitation of the Hawaiian race."

Judge Irwin is the only living member of the commission which journeyed to Washington in December 1919 to assist Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaʻole, Delegate to Congress, in urging amendment of the organic act. The delegation included, besides Prince Kuhio and Judge Irwin, Senators John H. Wise and Robert Shingle, of Oahu; Gov. John McCarthy, Representatives William T. Rawlins, of Oahu, and Henry Lyman, of Puna.

The delegation from Hawaii testified numerous times before the House Committee on Territories, Judge Irwin recalls, adding that Prince Kuhio did "most effective work," but the measure failed of passage in the 1920 session.

Another Commission, with Judge Irwin as adviser, went to Washington the following year. This group included Walter Dillingham, Albert Horner, Judge Hatch, and others.

There was plenty of opposition. It came from interests opposed to withdrawal of lands exclusively for the Hawaiians, and the attorneys for these interests fought every step of the proposal in Washington.

Judge Irwin declined to identify these interests.

"They're all dead now, anyway," he said.

But the mission was successful, and the Homes Commission bill was embodied in the organic act.

As it has worked out through the years, the opposing ranch and cattle interests were not much affected after all, because they were able to lease the Homes Commission lands and continue ranching much as before.

The only difference was that they had a different landlord—the Homes Commission instead of the Territory.

Now, almost 20 years later, the situation has changed a great deal.

The land commission is launched on a program of breaking up the great leases into smaller areas, large enough to be self-sufficient but small enough to answer a long-standing demand for wider distribution of land resources.

Not just homes commission lands, but an important phase of big island economy seems to be at stake.

Mr. NOBRIGA. I was going to state also that as to this question of Kamuela, the irrigation project, the Reclamation Bureau sent to Honolulu two engineers to look into the possibilities of qualifying under these funds.

Governor Stainback has been trying for the last several years to make lands available to the people to alleviate this unemployment situation which we have been talking about here.

We have Mr. Collin Lennox here who is president of the Territorial Board of Agriculture and Forestry, and very much acquainted with this problem. He could give you information if you want it for the committee.

The relation of this question just raised by Delegate Farrington, in the development of this Kamuela irrigation project and how it was blocked possibly by this Hawaiian group in the House of Representatives at the last session—in this connection, there is some information that you could use for your committee.

That is where the farmers live, in this area, who are protesting against this inclusion of the provision in H. R. 49. It gives a pretty good introduction to this whole problem.

Senator TAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Nobriga.

Mr. NOBRIGA. Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify, Mr. Chairman, and to read these resolutions just mentioned:

[Resolution No. 19, April 17, 1950, deferred to April 18, 1950]

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE CONGRESS TO AMEND H. R. 49, AND THEN TO ENACT SAID BILL

Be it resolved by the Constitutional Convention of Hawaii, That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby requested to enact H. R. 49, first amending it in the following particulars:

(1) Delete section 2, and renumber the following sections:

(2) Substitute for the first paragraph of section 3, the following:

"The convention which convened in Honolulu on the 4th day of April 1950 to write a constitution for the proposed State of Hawaii having declared on behalf of the people of said proposed state that they adopt the Constitution of the United States, said convention shall be, and is hereby, authorized to form a constitution and State government for said proposed State."

(3) Delete subsection "sixth" of section 3, and redesignate the following subsection "sixth";

(4) Delete from subsection (d) of section 4 of the clause "for the betterment of the conditions of native Hawaiians, as defined in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended,".

(5) Delete from section 15 the clause "except as hereinbefore provided with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Act, 1920, as amended;," substituting for the comma immediately preceding said clause a colon; and "*Be it further resolved*, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to the Congress from Hawaii."

Dated: Honolulu, T. H., April 17, 1950.

Offered by: Marguerite K. Ashford.

[Resolution No. 21, referred to Committee on the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, April 19, 1950]

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE CONGRESS TO REPEAL THE HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION ACT, 1920, AS AMENDED, AND TO GRANT FREE SIMPLE TITLE TO THE HOMESTEADERS UNDER SAID ACT

Whereas H. R. 49 requires that the constitution drawn for the proposed State of Hawaii "shall be republican in form and make no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race, color, or sex, and not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and principles of the Declaration of Independence"; and

Whereas no race is forever in the ascendant; and

Whereas the hope and future of Hawaii rests in the harmony of the various races whose members are citizens of Hawaii; and

Whereas the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, discriminates between citizens entitled to public lands on the basis not only of race but a percentage of the blood of that race; and

Whereas the Newlands resolution of July 7, 1898, in accepting from the government of the Republic of Hawaii the cession and transfer to the United States of the absolute fee and ownership of all public, government, or Crown lands, provides that "all revenue from or proceeds of the same, as regards such part thereof as may be used or occupied for the civil, military, or naval purposes of the United States, or may be assigned for the use of the local government, shall be used solely for the benefit of the inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands for educational and other public purposes"; and

Whereas such resolution made no racial distinction between the inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands; and

Whereas the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, tends to create racial dissension; and

Whereas it would be most unfair to the innocent homesteaders now occupying lands under said act, as lessees, to deprive them of such lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby requested to repeal the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, and, in the same legislation, to provide for the granting of fee simple title in their lands to present holders and occupants of leasehold lands under said act; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Delegate to the Congress from Hawaii.

Offered by: Marguerite K. Ashford, Delegate, Third District; and Harold W. Rice, Delegate, Third District.

Honolulu, T. H., April 19, 1950.

STATEMENT OF SAMUEL WILDER KING, CHAIRMAN OF HAWAII STATEHOOD COMMISSION

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I have been familiar with the Hawaiian Homes Commission program since its inception in 1920. I join with the great majority of the people of Hawaii in desiring to see it preserved.

If statehood were not granted, it would continue because it is now a part of the Organic Act of the Territory of Hawaii and cannot be amended by Hawaii except with the approval of Congress.

So far the legislatures of Hawaii have supported the program very liberally. The original law provided \$1,000,000 as a revolving fund and made no allowance for any administrative expense. Within a few short years a considerable amount of the money had been spent for administrative expense, and there was not enough money left to provide for a large number of homesteaders.

This is not an effort to differentiate so much as to supplement the ordinary homesteading and small farming in the Territory. I am in considerable sympathy with Senator Nobriga's effort to get the use of more land for the small ranchers and farmers.

There are other public lands available which, under the provisions of the organic act, and undoubtedly under the provisions of the constitution which the State of Hawaii may adopt—will be open for settlement by people of any racial extraction.

It happens that this issue rose when a particular group of farmers and ranchers desired very urgently to get possession of a particular piece of land that was under the Hawaiian Homes Commission. This particular piece of land had been under lease for some years for ranching purposes. There was no water available for its development. The project that was initiated in the legislature to develop it for general homesteading, as Senator Nobriga mentioned, was blocked in the house of representatives.

I would not say blocked, but it failed of passage because the legislature did not want to throw open that land for general settlement. They wanted to develop that land for settlement by Hawaiians.

As Delegate Houston said, they are proposing now to open it up for settlement. There are a great many Hawaiians in that neighborhood who desire to file a claim or make an application for homesteads on that particular piece of land.

I would again like to repeat that under our general laws there are other lands available for settlement, for small farms and ranches. I do think that the Territorial administration has been a little slow in opening them up. Some of them were under long leases that are only now expiring. They will be opened up in the next few years. So that those who feel the need for small areas will be able to satisfy their desires.

One reason why we have not had more homesteaders on Hawaiian Homes lands has simply been lack of financing. The loans were originally \$1,000 for a house lot and \$3,000 for a farm. The loans are made for a long term of years, and do not revolve very fast. Since that revolving fund was increased the rate of increase of the number of settlers has become very much greater.

Today the Hawaiian Homes Commission has in mind a project on the island of Kauai, using the lands that Senator Cordon referred to that are now coming under the jurisdiction of the Homes Commission.

There is also a project on the very land that Senator Nobriga and his group have desired to use for general homesteads. In this specialized form of homesteading the lands are granted under a 99-year lease and not in fee simple. I can look forward to the time when a patent will be delivered to the homesteaders or their heirs. It is not true that the heirs of the homesteaders—the lessees—lose their rights of inheritance.

In the case of this lady, whose daughter will be ineligible to remain there under the existing law, nevertheless she has a vested estate in that lease, and the successor who may take up the lease must pay the fair value of improvements on the property, and that money descends to the heirs of this particular lady.

I realize that there are certain cases where the heirs of less than one-half Hawaiian blood may have to move from their homes and find new homes. But nevertheless they do not lose the capital investment in that property, in the improvements in their property, which is appraised and paid for by the successor in title.

There is another angle to this: the Part-Hawaiians who are eligible must be of the half blood or full blood. But not all who qualify care to go. They are those who have means of their own and do not want to take advantage of this act. It is a voluntary proposition. Under the specialized form of homesteading, if I were half-Hawaiian and wanted to file or apply for a leasehold, a farm, or house lot, I would do so. If I did not wish to do so, I do not have to do so.

It has helped many people to obtain homes who otherwise would be unable to obtain them. They do not have to pay for the value of the land. They get a lease for 99 years for \$1 a year. They are lent sums to put in improvements to be repaid over a long term of years at a low rate of interest. We do the same thing with the Farm Security Administration, now the Farmers Home Administration, under which program we finance farmers for 40 years with 3 percent interest.

This is a local program only in that it is a 99-year lease at no capital investment in the land itself. The group that are here as witnesses before this committee include about 20 members of our legislature. I understand they had a discussion on this subject before they left Hono-

lulu. Out of those 20 members, Senator Nobriga and one other were the only 2 who opposed the retention of this particular paragraph.

As has already been said, this is not a mandate that is beyond amendment or change. The legislature of the State of Hawaii may propose an amendment and send it to the Congress of the United States for concurrence. If there is general public opinion in back of the amendments, the Congress will undoubtedly approve it.

The legislature of Hawaii in 20 or 25 or 30 years may ask Congress to abolish the present lease basis and grant patent to those who are homesteading and have lived upon their leases for 30, 40, or 50 years, as the case may be.

So it is not something that you are placing upon the State of Hawaii that is beyond repeal or beyond change. So far, every time that there has been an amendment to the original law—there have been many minor, small administrative amendments—they have all been initiated by our legislature and approved by Congress.

In the 8 years that I served as Delegate from Hawaii I think in every single session I had some small amendment to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act to introduce at the request of our legislature, and they were always approved and incorporated in the law.

The same procedure may be followed hereafter. The only point at issue is whether we should abolish the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act at this time.

The other point at issue is why should we have it in the enabling bill. I for one feel that it should not be abolished at this time, that it should be continued as presently set up for some years to come. The desire to abolish it should spring from Hawaii; it should come as a request to Congress to liquidate it or amend it in some substantial way.

Senator ECTON. Right at that point, Mr. King. Is it imperative that it be included in the statehood bill?

Mr. KING. Except by general public desire of the people of Hawaii, including two legislatures and general consensus of opinion. There has been practically no opposition to this program for the last 30 years. There has been a great deal of public support and a great deal of support from our legislature whose members have to run for election and are elected by the people. It was written into the bill to require that the constitution should include the act. If it were stricken out of the bill, the constitutional convention could nevertheless include the act as a part of the constitution.

That may be what in your wisdom you may decide to do. However, I would hesitate to approve, or to put it the other way, I would urge you to leave the provision in the bill because that is what the people of Hawaii have asked you to do. The present form of the enabling bill has had the verdict, the approval of the people of Hawaii on every occasion when it has been put up for public approval. The opposition comprises a very small group and happens to be a group that particularly want a piece of Hawaiian Homes Commission land.

Senator ECTON. You can't blame them for that.

Mr. KING. I do not. I have asked them, and I said this to Senator Nobriga himself:

I am in full sympathy with what you are trying to do if you would make your target other lands than the Homes Commission lands in the Territory and not now used, and not those lands reserved for settlement by people of half or full Hawaiian blood.

The reason for not granting a fee title at this time is to give those people who want a homestead a better opportunity to adjust themselves to the economic conditions in Hawaii. It is purely a voluntary condition on their part. I remember very well when this bill was first proposed in Congress in 1920. It was a political issue in 1922. The point was made that the bill would treat the Hawaiians as Indians who were going to be put on a reservation. Nevertheless, the proponents of the bill were overwhelmingly elected, the opponents were overwhelmingly defeated, and it was pointed out very clearly that it had no comparison with a reservation in that it was a purely voluntary matter. In the audience here are members of this delegation, including a gentleman from the island of Molokai who has a homestead under lease. The people themselves do not want the fee at this time. It may be that within 20 or 30 years they may go to our legislature and say, "We have lived on the land long enough and we want the fee simple title to this land," and it would be patented to them in some way approved by the State of Hawaii and the United States Congress.

This is the first instance that I can think of offhand where a Territory desiring to be a State has asked Congress to put in the proposed State constitution some consideration or some restriction in favor of a certain group of people, its inhabitants. In most cases where States have been created it has been the Federal Government which has taken the initiative to reserve certain lands for the Indians or others who lived in that State. It seems to me that this committee might well say if the Legislature of Hawaii has approved of this idea on two different occasions, if it has been the subject of discussion in Hawaii for a great many years and the people of Hawaii want it, then there should be no objection to including it in the bill. It is a voluntary request on our part that you require that our constitution have this provision. This enabling act has other such national restrictions. The constitution must be republican in character, and it must subscribe to the Constitution of the United States and contain other general limitations usual in State constitutions. We do not permit the people of a Territory to draft a constitution without some direction and instruction. We have voluntarily asked Congress to add to those national and general limitations and instructions an instruction to incorporate in the State constitution the substance or the basis of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

I would like to repeat the argument. If statehood were not granted, this act would continue. The purpose that Senator Nobriga desires to achieve would not be achieved. He would have to go before the legislature and have them approve of a memorial to Congress or come directly to Congress asking to abandon the existing law which is now incorporated right in our Organic Act, which is a part of the organic law of the Territory of Hawaii.

SENATOR TAYLOR. What is being done with the lands from the Homes Commission now which are not held by these 1,100 or 1,300 homesteaders?

MR. KING. Under the law they are leased to any lessee.

SENATOR TAYLOR. Leased in big blocks?

MR. KING. That is a point of this argument where I would agree with Senator Nobriga that he has some reason to complain. It has been in the past leased in large blocks. I am not a member of the

Territorial government. I do very strongly approve of the program of leasing public lands in smaller blocks. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I go further than that. Section 73 of the Organic Act lays it as an instruction on the Territory of Hawaii to homestead the public domain wherever possible. I think that wherever there is a piece of Government land available that is not needed for public purposes it should be homesteaded and the fee offered to those who desire the land and want to live on it as ranchers or farmers or as homes in house lots. We have done that in the Territory of Hawaii to a large extent, but not to as great an extent as we might have. In that document that I read from the other day, Senate Document 151, I think it is, of the Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, the report of the joint committee of Congress that went to Hawaii in 1937, there is a summary of the number of acres and of persons who have purchased homestead land, Government land homesteaded, some for house-lot purposes and some for farming.

Senator TAYLOR. Is the land that is leased in these large blocks sufficiently valuable that those lessees might put forth considerable effort to prevent the changing of this Hawaiian act?

Mr. KING. In some cases, yes. One of the arguments against leasing in small blocks is that the larger tenants are able to keep the land in good shape, particularly ranch land, cut out the cactus and weeds, and when the lease expires, the land is in good shape.

The Hawaiian Homes Commission does not want to have lands leased out that will be ruined in 15 years. The leases are short-term leases, relatively speaking. After 15 years, you do not want the land returned in bad condition. As fast as they can the Hawaiian Homes Commission expects to settle those lands with Hawaiians. They have only some 1,300 homesteaders representing a population of a little over 6,000 persons but they have many more hundreds of applicants.

Senator O'Mahoney brought up the point when he was here: was this an idea to get the lands retained for corporate farming? Only in one project is that true to some extent. That is not the purpose, but because there was no water on the island of Molokai the original homesteaders were forced to go into pineapple culture rather than general farming.

When I was Delegate I got a bill through the House, which died in the Senate, that would have promoted an irrigation and reclamation project on the island of Molokai and that would have given those homesteaders all the water they could have possibly used.

The laws could have gone into the general farming, in the raising of corn, cattle, hogs, and alfalfa. On that island they have had as high as 13 crops of alfalfa in 1 year. I understand the highest they can get in California under best conditions are six crops. Due to the lack of water the homesteaders have been almost forced to go into pineapple culture. Pineapple grows where you have light moisture and dew, and does not need irrigation. The Molokai homestead area is ideal pineapple land. They have contracted with three pineapple companies—two large and one small—and the pineapple companies pay them rent for land as Delegate Houston said. Then some of the homesteaders are employed by the pineapple companies.

Delegate Alfred Apaka is a member of the legislature from the county of Maui, and is one of the homesteaders on Molokai. He has had the trucking contract to truck the pines from the homestead area to the

water front. The pineapple industry supports the homestead settlement, but nevertheless each homesteader reserves some 5 acres for his own use and does have a small garden or chickens or some subsistence crop, not on a very high economic basis because of a lack of water.

The island of Molokai is a long, narrow island, and the north coast has three deep valleys which face the north. The mountains in back of these valleys precipitate the clouds coming from the North Pacific, and the water rolls down into the ocean at an estimated minimum of 50,000 gallons a day. The irrigation project was simply to run a tunnel through the dividing ridges between the valleys, tap the water and bring it to the homestead area and let it flow down by gravity and irrigate over 12,000 acres of land.

There are only 6,000 acres of land which have been homesteaded by the Hawaiian homesteaders in that section. I know almost all the homesteaders. They are not abstractions, they are persons. I know this lady quite well, whose letter has been introduced here, and I have considerable sympathy for her particular problem. And I know that the homesteaders want to preserve the integrity of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act under statehood until some time in the future.

Some reference was made to the lands reserved for this program. It is a subject that is perhaps as close to my interests as anything else in public affairs. The 169,000 acres mentioned includes a great deal of land that it is very difficult to do anything with except as ranch land and rather poor ranch land. The percentage of good arable land is rather small. So that the area cannot be considered as a very large amount.

Such ranch land may be cut up into small ranches of a few thousand acres and run as individual ranches for one family or for family farming. The principal activity has been, up to now, in house lots.

There again—Senator Ecton, you discussed this—we have housing projects in Hawaii in addition to these. These are just specialized projects for those of Hawaiian ancestry. But there are other large housing projects open to all the citizens of Hawaii.

So I may say that the whole program is not something that is diverted away from the stream of Hawaiian life, it is something to supplement other agencies that deal with all our citizens, regardless of whether of Hawaiian blood or not; and then there is this specialized form of rehabilitation, of homesteading, and housing project for people of Hawaiian blood who desire to take advantage of the special law.

I am Part-Hawaiian but not eligible under this act. The law as originally drawn included those of one-thirty-second Hawaiian blood. Perhaps it might have been better if this law had included those of quarter blood or more, but it did not. It was reduced from the original draft in the bill to include those of one-half or more Hawaiian blood. In any case, there is no self-interest in my support of this program.

There are possibly 30,000 people in Hawaii who are eligible under it, men, women, and children. If you cut that, divide that by five, probably 6,000 prospective homesteaders or owners of house lots under lease are eligible. We have so far gotten a little less than 1,400 on their own homes. So I feel that there is no objection to the retention of this particular paragraph in the enabling act. It meets the general approval of the people of Hawaii as expressed on every public occasion.

The opposition is small, it is aimed at one particular purpose, and a good deal of the statements made here are not exactly correct. One of the large Hawaiian estates mentioned, the Bishop estate, is an eleemosynary trust which supports two schools for Hawaiian boys and girls. Another estate is a land-owning corporation. The owners of another estate that was talked about are of such diminished Hawaiian blood that it is practically a large Caucasian state. It was founded by an Irishman who bought up so much land that when he died he left a great fortune in land. That is a trust estate that within a few years will expire.

We have the same laws in Hawaii that you have here—trust estates cannot continue beyond a certain number of years. They automatically expire. Then the estate is distributed to the heirs, it is sold and otherwise distributed in the general economy of the Territory. So many of the statements submitted by Senator Nobriga have to be qualified or interpreted in view of our local situation.

It would take too long to answer all of them. But I do want to repeat my request and my urgent recommendation that this committee leave the paragraph with regard to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act in the bill.

Thank you.

Senator TAYLOR. Senator Butler, do you have any questions?

Senator BUTLER. No, sir.

Senator TAYLOR. Senator Ecton?

Senator ECTON. No, sir.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I told the chairman that I would conclude our testimony today. So much time has been taken by so many other witnesses that I do not know what else we can do unless we run them through in the next 30 minutes. Some of them are leaving.

Senator TAYLOR. All right, let us go.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would like to ask that their statements be very brief.

We have Mr. Chuck Mau. As I understand it, he is going to make a brief presentation on behalf of the men from the other counties.

STATEMENT OF CHUCK MAU, HONOLULU, HAWAII, MEMBER OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

Mr. MAU. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, I ask leave to file two statements. The first relates to the city and county government of Honolulu. The second covers points which have already been touched upon by the preceding witnesses.

My name is Chuck Mau. I am of Chinese extraction, was born and reared in Honolulu, T. H., where I received my grammar- and high-school training. I attended the University of Colorado from which I obtained my arts and law degrees. By profession I am a lawyer and have practiced that profession for the past 18 years in the Territory of Hawaii. I have also been a deputy attorney general of the Territory of Hawaii. Presently I am a member of the board of supervisors of the city and county of Honolulu, and am serving my eighth year in that capacity. I am also an elected delegate to the constitutional convention, presently in session in Honolulu.

It may be of interest to you to know some of the community organizations with which I have been connected. I have been a member of the board of directors of Child and Family Service, a nonprofit organization interested in preventing the disintegration of family life, and the rehabilitation of broken homes; a member of the board of directors of the Honolulu Community Theater; and a member of the board of managers of the YMCA. I am a founder and member of the board of trustees of the Richards scholarship funds, which grants scholarships to university graduate students majoring in sociology; a charter member and a member of the board of trustees of the Leahi chapter of Crippled Children and Adults, Inc.; a member of the board of directors of Leahi Hospital; and a member of the board of trustees of Kokokahi Eleemosynary Corp., founded for educational and religious purposes.

I am here at the behest of the mayor and board of supervisors to present facts relating to the city and county government. It is my intention to file a written statement and, therefore, this oral statement will be brief.

The city and county of Honolulu is one of four county governments in the Territory. Since it is a creature of the Territorial legislature, all of its powers emanate from the legislature. The population of the city and county is approximately 355,000, which is approximately 67 percent of the population of the Territory.

The governmental structure of the city and county follows the pattern of the larger city and county governments on the mainland. It is headed by a mayor and a seven-member board of supervisors elected for 2-year terms. Four other officers, the treasurer, clerk, auditor, and sheriff are also elected for 2-year terms. Among the appointive department heads are the city and county attorney, prosecutor, controller, engineer, superintendent of buildings, fire chief and the physician who are appointed by the mayor, subject to confirmation of the board of supervisors.

The powers of the board of supervisors are very broad concerning local matters covering health, fire, police protection, highways and general welfare.

I call your attention to the salaries paid our department heads. The present average salary is \$10,470 per annum. Checking the Municipal Yearbook of 1949, we find that these salaries are generally higher than those paid to similar city and county officials in cities and/or counties of comparable size on the mainland of the United States. It is the belief of the city and county administration that in order to attract qualified and able men to government service we must be willing to pay for their qualifications and ability.

Unlike most mainland counties, the city and county of Honolulu does not have tax-levying powers. Our revenues are dependent upon the will of the Territorial legislature. About 40 percent of our revenues come from real property taxes and this year we will receive out of such taxes approximately \$8,000,000. The other 60 percent of our revenues are derived from franchise taxes, license fees, district court fines and forfeitures and garbage collection fees. The total estimated revenues for 1950 are just short of \$20,000,000.

You might like to know what some of our larger expenditures consist of—public safety, which includes police and fire protection, approximately \$4,000,000; highways, \$3,500,000; sanitation and waste

removal, \$2,200,000; public health, a little over \$1,000,000; school grounds and buildings, about \$2,000,000; and recreation, \$1,800,000.

As indicative of the progressive nature of the city and county administration, I would like to point out our sewer program. The plans for a modern sewer system for the city of Honolulu were prepared by the nationally and internationally known sanitation firm of engineers, Metcalf & Eddy, of Boston, Mass. These plans call for a total expenditure of \$21,000,000 covering a proposed 10-year program. The first phase of this program is already under way. Approximately \$7,000,000 of the \$21,000,000 have already been paid out or committed through public contracts.

You will be interested to know about the bonded indebtedness of the city and county. Under the organic act with the approval of the Territorial legislature and finally of the President of the United States, the city is authorized to issue bonds up to 5 percent of the assessed value of the real property in the city and county. This assessable value for 1950 has been set at \$253,000,000. This would allow a bond issue of \$12,650,000. As of December 31, 1949, the amount of outstanding general obligation bonds of the city and county is \$12,982,000.

The city and county has never defaulted in the payment of interest or principal on any of its bond obligations, and has repeatedly received substantial premiums on the sale of its bonds. In its publication, Manual of Government Securities, American and Foreign, Moody's Investors Service of New York, rates the general obligation bonds of the city and county at "A" which is a high rating.

The financial standing of the city and county has brought forth favorable reaction by the Congress. Many times has Congress empowered us to issue bonds beyond the 5 percent limitation imposed by the organic act, the last being Public Law 200 in the first session of the Eightieth Congress, under which the city and county was authorized to issue \$5,000,000 in general sewer improvement bonds beyond the limitation referred to.

The city and county of Honolulu was the first American community to put rent control into effect. The city and county rent control ordinance was enacted immediately after the inception of World War II and became effective on December 13, 1941. The local control of rent ceilings and of the eviction of tenants has continued throughout the war and is still in effect. So far as we know, all other American communities which had become congested due to war conditions were put under Federal OPA control through order of the President in establishing such localities as defense rental areas. However, the Federal Government, after close scrutiny of our local rent control ordinance and administration, saw fit to leave such control in the hands of the city and county government.

It may be of interest to this committee to know that the city and county administration was prepared for Pearl Harbor. In the middle of 1941 the mayor and board of supervisors, of which I was a member, created a major disaster council which was composed of top professional and businessmen. With funds provided by the board, the council purchased medical and hospital supplies. It also assisted in the organization and maintenance of a blood bank.

When the infamous seventh came, it sprang into instant action. Its personnel and equipment, including blood plasma, were rushed to the

aid of the military and naval services and to civilian casualties. The results of this preparedness for this dire emergency should be recorded in the Congressional Record.

Therefore, the mayor and board of supervisors of the city and county of Honolulu, respectfully submit that the people of the city and county are ready, able and willing to assume the responsibilities of statehood.

I would like to ask leave at this time to file several exhibits for the record. The first is the "Proposed budget and appropriation ordinance of the city and county of Honolulu for the year 1950." It was published in the newspapers as prescribed by law.

May I offer this as an exhibit?

Senator TAYLOR. Yes.

(The document was filed with the committee.)

Mr. MAU. May I also offer as an exhibit the annual report of the mayor of Honolulu for the year 1949. It shows the major governmental operations of the city for that year.

Senator TAYLOR. It may be received.

(The document was filed with the committee.)

Mr. MAU. The third is the only printed copy of the controller's report showing the financial condition of the city and county for the year ending December 31, 1948. May I also offer this as an exhibit?

Senator TAYLOR. I will be happy to receive it without objection.

(The document was filed with the committee.)

Mr. MAU. The statement that I have made with respect to the operations of the city and county government applies with equal force to all of the counties in the Territory. They operate under the same basic laws as the city and county of Honolulu.

The only exception is that our revenues and expenditures are much larger than those of the other outlying counties, made up of the island of Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai.

That concludes the statement for the city and county. I would like to add one more sentence for the record. As a citizen of Chinese ancestry, who has many friends in all religious and racial groups in the Territory, I can say without hesitation or equivocation that the loyalty of Americans of Japanese ancestry cannot be questioned. Likewise that of all other racial groups in the Territory.

Hawaiians, Caucasians, including those whose ancestors came from Spain and Portugal originally, Filipinos, Puerto Ricans, Koreans, they are all loyal American citizens. I have associated with them all of my lifetime in the islands and I know them to be loyal. And because of my racial extraction I want to speak up for the other races in that respect.

Senator TAYLOR. You do not think there is any disposition on the part of the Chinese, because China has gone Communist, for them to look with favor on that philosophy?

Mr. MAU. Not at all, Mr. Chairman.

Senator TAYLOR. You think that an American of Chinese, Japanese, or any Asiatic descent is just as capable of being loyal to America as a citizen of German, English, French, or any other descent, and that there is no difference?

Mr. MAU. Absolutely. We are very much concerned about Asia, as a matter of fact, hoping that something can be done through international channels to stop the spread of communism. I know that we are doing all we can in the Territory of Hawaii to stop it.

Senator TAYLOR. Any questions, Senator Butler?

Senator BUTLER. No, sir. I would like to add that I think we can all agree with this sentence: that color is no test of character. I do not think you need to worry very much about any colorations with reference to Hawaii.

Senator TAYLOR. Senator Ecton?

Senator ECTON. It is a very good statement.

Senator TAYLOR. Yes, it is.

(The supplementary statement of Chuck Mau is as follows:)

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF CHUCK MAU

The people of Hawaii want statehood. In accordance with the recommendation of a joint congressional committee investigating the question of statehood, Hawaii held a plebiscite in 1940, and the result thereof showed that the people were for statehood, 2 to 1. I venture to say that today the vote would probably reach 4 to 1. The recent election for delegates to the present constitutional convention brought out 80 percent of the vote of the Territory of Hawaii, showing the great interest we have on the subject of statehood.

The people of the 48 States are also in favor of statehood for Hawaii. The last Gallup poll indicated that of those who were polled, 64 percent favored it. Editorials of the leading newspapers in our country also favor it. The President and the Secretary of the Interior are wholeheartedly for it.

So far we have had five congressional investigations and three hearings, two of which were held in Washington, D. C. In the reports of each congressional investigating committee, statehood for Hawaii was looked upon with great favor. In not one single requirement for statehood was Hawaii found wanting.

The people of Hawaii have a strong desire to become full-fledged citizens of the United States, not just half citizens. They want to be able to exercise the full rights and privileges which are accorded to each one of you here in the 48 States. They want to vote for their President, their United States Senators and Congressmen, for their own Governor and other State officials.

We have an historic complaint to make—"Taxation without representation." It may be interesting to many of you to know that Hawaii paid into the Federal Treasury in 1949 \$84,000,000 in Federal taxes. This is more than each of 10 States paid to the Federal Government last year.

For 50 years, Hawaii has been operating under a democratic form of government patterned after governments of the 48 States. The principles of democracy, therefore, are not foreign to us; rather, we are steeped in it.

The leading educators of our country have stated that the educational system of the Territory of Hawaii is based upon the highest of standards.

Hawaii is economically sound.

Pacific and Asiatic affairs are of great moment to our country. The peoples of China, India, Japan, and all of the Pacific isles are watching with keen interest the kind of treatment that is accorded to the Territory of Hawaii by our Nation. They know that we aspire to statehood, and if immediate statehood is granted to Hawaii, it will exert a tremendous influence in favor of democracy throughout this troubled and unstable world. Statehood for Hawaii would be a forceful blow to communism in Asia.

The loyalty and patriotism of our people cannot be questioned. During the first terrifying and disastrous hours of Pearl Harbor and the confused and chaotic days following, sabotage could have been easily accomplished. All of our public utilities, including our water system, electricity, communications, transportation, wharves, and bridges could have been destroyed, but not one act of sabotage was committed. Furthermore, people went right to work to help win the war. There was no disruption in war work, or any other kind of work, in the ranks of labor. In each campaign conducted by the Treasury Department of the Federal Government in the sale of United States war bonds, Hawaii more than met its quota and in most of the bond-selling campaigns we went four or five hundred percent beyond the quotas set for us. Because of this the people of Hawaii have been commended by the Treasury Department of the United States. While the security of our country was threatened we accepted rigid military restrictions—restrictions which none of the 48 States has ever experienced or perhaps will ever experience. The obvious reason for this was that the only goal the civilian population had was the winning of the war.

To many of you our military record is familiar. The people back home are proud of their fighting men comprised of native Hawaiians, Filipinos, Caucasians, including those from Spain and Portugal, and Americans of Chinese, Korean, and Japanese ancestry. Who can forget when the famed 442d Regimental Combat Team, more than half of whom were soldiers of Japanese ancestry from Hawaii, was called upon to perform the dangerous mission of rescuing the lost Texas battalion. Certainly not the people of Texas, nor the people of the other 48 States. Our boys brought these Texas boys back to safety and in so doing achieved a brilliant military victory. Our boys of the 100th Battalion and the 442d Regimental Combat Team were not drafted into the Army. They practically went on their knees begging the commanding generals to put them into uniforms and to send them into combat areas. Why? Because suspicion had been cast upon them concerning their loyalty to the United States. It was their fervent hope and wish to be granted an opportunity to dispel that suspicion. They did. You and I know that the highest indicia of citizenship is that one be willing to die for his country. We have been told that the 100th Battalion and the 442d Regimental Combat Team have the highest percentage of those killed in action of all ground units in the United States Army. They are two of the most highly decorated units in military annals. Their glorious and heroic deeds and the brilliance of their military record have been told and retold by many of our great generals, by many of our statesmen, by many of our leading newspapers and magazines. Our boys have carved their niche in Valhalla. Today, the bodies of our boys lie buried in the bitter, bloody battlefield of Germany, Italy, France, the South Pacific isles, and the Burma theater. I know that they have not died in vain. If they could speak to you today they would make but one plea: "Please grant immediate statehood to Hawaii."

Hawaii has earned the right to become a full-fledged member of this our glorious Union. She deserves it. She is worthy of it.

STATEMENT OF WILFORD D. GODBOLD, CITY AND COUNTY ATTORNEY OF HONOLULU

Mr. GODBOLD. Mr. Chairman, my name is Wilford D. Godbold. I am presently city and county attorney of Honolulu, and have been for 31½ years. Prior to that time I was chief deputy, city and county attorney, for a number of years, and held other governmental positions such as district judge, Territorial district judge, United States Commissioner, and so forth.

I was born in Alabama, went to Hawaii at a preschool age, received all my education, including university, at the high schools, was a graduate of the University of Hawaii, and returned to the mainland and received a law degree.

I do not believe there is anything that I can add to the statements that have already been made, except for this one thing: There has not been mentioned in the record the percentage of vote on statehood in the islands as it stands now.

You may recall that the percentage was 2 to 1 in favor of statehood at the plebiscite held in 1940. From my associations and contacts, I believe that the vote presently would be 20 to 1 in favor of statehood.

The major objection to statehood in 1940 was the fear by a large proportion of the people of Hawaii that the Japanese, the people of Japanese ancestry, would not be loyal to the United States in the event of war.

You have in your record complete proof of their loyalty and I know of no other objection that I have ever heard in the islands to statehood. Thank you.

Senator ECRON. What were the qualifications to vote on statehood? Those that had voted in the previous elections; what were they?

Mr. GODBOLD. Senator, you had to be qualified to vote for a Representative. In other words, you had to be a resident of the Territory for 1 year, and of the district in which you were voting for 3 months, prior to the election.

Senator TAYLOR. Is there any Negro population in Hawaii?

Mr. GODBOLD. Prior to the war there were practically none, just a handful. There were some workers who came in during the war, and who have remained. I could not give you the exact number, but there are fewer than a thousand Negroes in Hawaii at present.

Senator TAYLOR. Is the racial equality and tolerance extended to the other groups extended to the Negroes?

Mr. GODBOLD. That is correct. There is no Negro segregation of any sort in Hawaii.

Senator TAYLOR. From what we have heard, there is no segregation, nor is there any prejudice of any kind, and every man is a man regardless of color.

Mr. GODBOLD. That is correct. I have seen people who were southerners from the deep South go to Hawaii and get that feeling in their hearts in a very short time.

Senator TAYLOR. Have you any further questions, Senator Butler?

Senator BUTLER. No, sir.

Senator TAYLOR. Senator Ecton?

Senator ECTON. You believe the desire for statehood on the part of the people of Hawaii has steadily grown year by year?

Mr. GODBOLD. Yes, sir. I believe the desire has always been there, but there were doubts in the minds of some of the people prior to the war. If there are any doubts now, we do not hear it, and I doubt if there are very many.

Senator TAYLOR. Do you ever go back to Alabama?

Senator BUTLER. Louisiana?

Mr. GODBOLD. Alabama is where I came from, although I have a souvenir from Louisiana, my wife.

Senator TAYLOR. Do you ever go back down there?

Mr. GODBOLD. Occasionally.

Senator TAYLOR. What do those folks have to say when you tell them about the way the races get along in Honolulu?

Mr. GODBOLD. I have not had to tell them, because so many of my friends have been in Hawaii during the war. They even in the service picked up our idea, and we are doing things very quickly out there.

Senator TAYLOR. Thank you very much.

Mr. GODBOLD. Thank you, sir.

STATEMENT OF JAMES KIMO KEALOHA, EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE COUNTY OF HAWAII

Mr. FARRINGTON. James Kimo Kealoha, of the county of Hawaii, has a brief statement to present.

Mr. KEALOHA. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is James Kimo Kealoha, chairman and executive officer of the county of Hawaii. I am a Republican of Hawaiian-Chinese parentage, born and raised in Hawaii and educated under the American educational system in the islands.

I believe a brief résumé of my position is necessary to qualify my presence here at this statehood hearing.

I have served as a member of the Territorial house of representatives, a member of the Territorial senate, a member of the Hawaii County board of supervisors and finally elected its chairman and executive officer, an elective service of approximately 14 years.

The county government of the islands is a creature of the Territorial governments, its creation was made possible by the Organic Act passed by the Congress in April 1900.

The County of Hawaii is one of the four island counties of our island Territory, the largest in area, with 4,030 square miles, almost double the neighboring counties combined, with a population of approximately 76,000. The board of supervisors of Hawaii County is composed of seven members, one of whom seeks election at large and serves as chairman and executive officer of the county.

My present board of supervisors are evenly split—with three Democrats and three Republicans and the chairman a Republican, thus having a Republican majority. Every member of my board of supervisors has signed the oath of loyalty card, similar to those explained by Representative Fong yesterday relative to communism, and so forth, and I am happy to state that we have no Communist on our board to the best of my knowledge.

With my appointment by Representative Fong, chairman of the Territorial Holdover Committee, the board of supervisors deeply felt that the county of Hawaii should express its official endorsement of statehood for Hawaii now. They therefore appropriated out of much-needed funds for the administration of our county government, sufficient county funds to pay for my trip and expenses to Washington, D. C., and return.

Mr. Chairman, and members of this committee, we in Hawaii of diverse racial extractions live in harmony; we enjoy the cultural contributions of the many races; we jealously guard our rights as true American citizens and follow our own religions and social lines according to our choice.

We deeply and sincerely believe in the American way of life, and in order that this way of life be perpetuated the youths of the islands have contributed and given that supreme sacrifice and their all during the great wars that we may live and enjoy the American way of life.

They have faithfully followed the American pattern of life. We have fulfilled our Nation's demands and recommendations in the administration of our island Territory. We prepare our children in the great schools of the United States of America so that they may lead us in the State of Hawaii. We have taken stock of our aspirations believing and hoping for statehood for Hawaii throughout the years and with turn of the half-a-century we feel that we have faithfully served our apprenticeship for statehood.

Your approval of statehood for Hawaii is a symbol of American justice on which the eyes of the whole world is focused.

Perhaps this is not the proper time for me to quote the Scriptures; nevertheless, I pause to insert these passages: "Knock and it shall be opened unto you." "Ask and it shall be given."

Gentlemen, you have responded to our knocking by opening your doors to hear our pleas at this Senate hearing, thereby fulfilling the words of the first passage. We await your fulfillment of this second passage: "Ask and it shall be given."

We, the people of the Territory of Hawaii, now humbly ask you gentlemen, the fathers of our great Nation in whose hands and hearts rest the decision of granting our request, to recommend and approve the passage of H. R. 49, the admission of the Territory of Hawaii as a State of the Union.

There is nothing further that I can add to the testimonies already presented to you by more informed witnesses before me; and in closing I thank this honorable group for the time and privilege allotted me; and I pray that the good Lord will bless you and guide you in your deliberations for the progress, welfare, and safety of our Nation.

Thank you and "Mahalo nui loa."

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM ELLIS, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF KAUAI

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. William Ellis. Mr. Ellis is making his first trip to the States from the island of Kauai.

Senator TAYLOR. How do you like our island?

Mr. ELLIS. Fine. I am sent here as a delegate from Hawaii to tell you that we are ready for statehood, Aloha, and to invite you to come to our island.

I am the chairman and executive officer of the county of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii, said county embracing the islands of Kauai and Niihau. I have held this office for a period of nine terms, or a period of 18 years. I am of Hawaiian-Chinese-Irish ancestry, having a family—wife and four girls and two boys.

One of my daughters graduated from Drury College in Missouri in 1948, and presently will be studying in England as the result of being awarded a national Rotarian scholarship for study abroad. At the present time, two of my daughters are attending Drury College and one of my sons is attending George Washington University, here in Washington, D. C., studying law.

It is not my idea to take too much of your time as previous speakers have fully covered most of the arguments concerning our request for statehood. So I will confine myself to the simple statement of saying that I am not only endorsing and supporting statehood but that I concur in all testimony offered to your honorable body and support the same.

I am asking your consideration in admitting Hawaii into the sisterhood of States immediately.

As a student of government during the past 18 years, I feel I may truly state that we are ready for the same.

I am in Washington representing the people of the islands of Kauai and Niihau. And I state that it is the wish of the majority of my people that you do offer your support to H. R. 49 which will enable Hawaii to become a State of the Union.

Mr. FARRINGTON. There are several members of the Hawaiian Statehood Commission who should be given an opportunity to make an appearance.

Mr. Gavien A. Bush, a member, has had to leave. I would like to submit his statement for the record.

(The statement and resolution are as follows:)

STATEMENT OF GAVIN A. BUSH, MEMBER OF THE HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD
COMMISSION

I am Gavin A. Bush, a member of the Hawaiian Statehood Commission, and a resident of the Territory of Hawaii for over 50 years. I am manager of two agencies for General Motors on the island of Hawaii.

I am well acquainted with Senator Cordon, and it was my privilege to assist him in his on-the-spot investigation of the people of Hawaii, particularly with regard to the county of Hawaii. It was a real pleasure to introduce Senator Cordon to the elected officials of my county and to be of service to him in the conducting of a public hearing in the city of Hilo.

It has likewise been my pleasure to meet with and know Senator Butler. Our dinner engagement at the Volcano House on the brink of Kilauea, and later that evening, the viewing of movies produced by the National Park Service of our volcanoes in action, are extremely pleasant memories. Senator Butler had a painfully sore foot at that time, the result of an unfortunate experience with a horse, but nevertheless he toured our islands extensively.

I was born in Oakland, Calif., and, with my parents, moved to Honolulu, T. H., in the fall of 1898, a few weeks after annexation. We made the trip to Honolulu by sailing ship.

I was educated in the public schools of Honolulu and graduated from the College of Mechanical Engineering in the University of California at Berkeley. I followed the engineering business for some 20 years and became a branch manager in Hilo, T. H., for the Honolulu Iron Works, a sugar machinery manufacturing company with a world-wide reputation.

About 15 years ago I went into the automobile business in Hilo, and I now manage two automotive distributorships which handle all makes of cars and trucks produced by General Motors Corp. Our two companies are the only ones on the island or in the county of Hawaii that are franchised by General Motors. Last year our two companies did about \$3,000,000 worth of business.

I believe that my relations with labor are excellent. The three companies which I have managed in the past 35 years all have employed comparatively large forces, and have never experienced a labor dispute.

Presently I am the chairman of the Republican County Committee in Hilo, T. H., and I have held that office for the past 5 years. I have always been interested in politics and I become actively involved politically when I became a member of the board of supervisors, county of Hawaii, by appointment in 1931; subsequently I was twice reelected and served in this capacity for a total of 6 years' time.

I think I know the people of Hawaii. I have lived rather closely with them. I have great confidence in their ability to govern themselves successfully in a fashion that will be a real credit to our great Union. We are fully capable of carrying on in Hawaii as good American citizens with all the responsibilities that would develop under statehood. I believe that we of Hawaii are ready and that we should have statehood now.

Some 64 organizations in the Territory of Hawaii have presented resolutions urging statehood for Hawaii. So far as I know, no organization of any kind, either Territorial or National, has on record a resolution opposing statehood for Hawaii.

I am pleased to offer this for the record for the sixty-fifth Hawaii resolution—a resolution from the Hawaii Island Chamber of Commerce endorsing statehood for Hawaii.

Whereas Hawaii was annexed as a Territory of the United States by mutual agreement between the former Republic of Hawaii and the United States, and such annexation has been of immeasurable value to the United States as well as the people of Hawaii; and

Whereas Hawaii is one of the two remaining Territories of the United States, the other 29 Territories which have been organized in the history of the Union all having been admitted to statehood, the average period of pupillage being 20 years; and

Whereas it was well understood when Hawaii was organized as a Territory in 1900, that it too would be admitted as a State, the territorial form of government being necessarily only a transitory one, to be followed by statehood as soon as the people of the Territory are capable of self-government; and

Whereas in the 50 years since annexation of Hawaii it has become a modern American community, with a sound economy and a healthy and literate people, who have shown themselves to be fully capable of self-government; and

Whereas the people of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question their loyalty and patriotism to the Government of the United States; and

Whereas several congressional committees during the past decade have reported to Congress that "the Territory of Hawaii has met every necessary requirement to be admitted as a State of the Union"; and

Whereas the people of Hawaii have served a satisfactory pupillage in the limited self-government permitted by the organic act of Congress, and desire the usual prerogatives of other American citizens—voting representation in the United States Congress, a vote for the President, and the selection of their own Governor; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior and the President of the United States have unqualifiedly endorsed immediate statehood for Hawaii; and

Whereas by all the criteria used to determine public sentiment—newspaper support, public opinion polls, endorsement by national organizations—Hawaii has received an overwhelming vote of confidence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Hawaii Island Chamber of Commerce, in regular meeting assembled in Hilo, T. H. this 25th day of April AD 1950, That this organization endorses and it hereby goes on record as favoring immediate action by the Eighty-first Congress of the United States to enable Hawaii to be admitted as a State; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the chairman of the United States House of Representatives Committee on Public Lands, the Secretary of the Interior, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, the Governor of Hawaii, the Washington office of the Hawaii Statehood Commission the Honolulu Office of the Hawaii Statehood Commission, and the United States Chamber of Commerce in Washington, D. C.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Katsuro Miho, who has a brief statement to make.

STATEMENT OF KATSURO MIHO, MEMBER OF HAWAII STATEHOOD COMMISSION

Mr. MIHO. I am Katsuro Miho, an American citizen of Japanese ancestry. I am a member of the statehood commission and served on the former citizens statehood committee. I was educated at the University of Utah and at the George Washington Law School.

Returning to Hawaii as an attorney, I was associated with Governor Stainback's law office until he was appointed Governor.

During the war years, Speaker Fong, an American citizen of Chinese ancestry, whom you heard the other day, and I, an American citizen of Japanese ancestry, started the first inter-racial law firm in Hawaii when China and Japan, the mother country of our parents were arrayed against each other in a war for survival.

My parents came to Hawaii as Japanese language school teachers. My brothers and I grew up in as intense a Japanese home as any nisei could have. My father used to tease us and say that we could never become accepted as full Americans because our color would never change.

As a child I was even shipped over to Japan. There, because I was considered a foreigner, they called me a pumpkin from Hawaii, which resulted in enumerable fist fights and finally ended in my grandparents promptly shipping me back to Hawaii, for which I shall be eternally grateful.

My youngest brother, a veteran of the Four Hundred and Forty-second, is now a student at George Washington Law School. I lost one brother in the last war and my father was interned for almost 5 years during that same war.

Today, my parents, born Buddhists, have been converted to Christianity. I bring these personal matters to your attention because I deeply feel that it may be of some help in your deliberations.

When my partner, Hiram L. Fong, spoke of his appreciation of the American way of life, may I add that he spoke for everyone of us, no matter of what ancestry.

The so-called problems of assimilation and Americanization, loyalty, and love of country have all been tested and tried in Hawaii.

Gentleman, it is to this day an uplifting and almost unbelievable fact for me to realize how strongly, how deeply and sincerely our fellow Americans of Caucasian ancestry want and are fighting for statehood. This is indicative of their feelings and convictions that the citizens of Hawaii regardless of race are true Americans and can be trusted as such.

I would like to convey to you the parting thought that my father suggested as I left Honolulu. The yearning for statehood is in essence the yearning for justice and faith in the ideal of the brotherhood of man. We in America are the only hope left in this dark world and statehood will in no small measure provide a beacon of hope.

In conclusion, gentlemen, may I repeat the words of my former teacher, Senator Thomas of Utah, who said to us students during the crucial days of the depression of 1931, "Have faith in the innate common sense and sense of fair play of America." And I remember the words of President Roosevelt, who said in his first inaugural address that the only thing to fear is fear itself.

These thoughts are applicable to our plea for statehood. Do not fear us. Have faith in us. I know we will not fail you even as we have not in the past.

I would like to add a few words: There are so many of the delegation from Hawaii of so many different racial ancestry. That fact alone, and the sincerity with which they plead their case, and all of the question which have been raised have been tried and tested and found not wanting in Hawaii.

With their means of investments and all of their efforts in Hawaii, if we do not merit statehood, they are the ones who will suffer, who are on the front lines, and they are the ones who are pleading most. It is simply a great eye opener to me.

I went to George Washington University here. Senator Thomas was my teacher from Utah. It is an almost unbelievable fact that so many of other than oriental ancestry have been pleading our cause both here in the Nation's Capital and in Hawaii.

I bring that message back to my people in Hawaii.

Thank you.

Senator TAYLOR. Thank you, sir.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Arthur Woolaway of the island of Maui, a member of our commission.

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR D. WOOLAWAY, MEMBER, HAWAII STATEHOOD COMMISSION

Mr. WOOLAWAY. I would like to file my statement and introduce a resolution as presented by the Chamber of Commerce of Maui.

Senator TAYLOR. It will be made a part of the record.

(The statement and resolution are as follows:)

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR D. WOOLAWAY

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Arthur D. Woolaway, an official of the Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co., Ltd., on the island of Maui. This company is the largest sugar plantation in the Nation. I was born and raised in Hawaii, and since becoming of voting age, I have also been a Republican.

I appear here today with deep-citizen interest in statehood. I am a member of the Hawaiian Statehood Commission, and was elected to the Hawaii State constitution convention. In the convention I am vice president from the second senatorial district.

Gentlemen, it seem to me that the diversity of races in Hawaii is the main handicap in the eyes of Congress in our plea for statehood.

We feel the racial complexity of Hawaii is a tremendous asset to the United States. Our moral prestige as a nation among the other countries of the world is very high. The eyes of the peoples of the world are on us as never before. Our democratic principles that preach equal rights regardless of race is the beacon of hope. However, unless we practice our democratic principles, we will lose our place of high standing in the eyes of the world by so much as we deviate from that practice. Hawaii's progress in democracy and her plea for State government is a matter of interest throughout the Pacific world, as well as in Russia.

As we sit before you, judge us not by ancestry, an act of God, but by our contributions and assets as Americans. As individuals we profess to be of good Christian faith and champions of American principles. Let it not be said of the United States that our Nation adheres to principles of democracy only when it suits a purpose.

Will you then as Americans in good faith in the eyes of God and the nations of the world judge us by ancestry or by our contributions and loyalty as American citizens? What justification can there be before our country and the nations of the world for denying us a logical promotion from the transitory status of a Territory to a permanent position of a State, a promotion in American tradition following precedents of American history?

The onus should be on the opponents of statehood. Unless they show good cause why Hawaii should not be a State to the satisfaction of this committee, I urge you to act favorable on our plea before you in the eyes of God and the peoples of the world.

Whereas Hawaii was annexed as a Territory of the United States by mutual agreement between the former Republic of Hawaii and the United States, and such annexation has been of immeasurable value to the United States as well as the people of Hawaii, and

Whereas Hawaii is one of the two remaining Territories of the United States, the other 29 Territories which have been organized in the history of the Union all having been admitted to statehood, the average period of pupilage being 20 years, and

Whereas it was well understood when Hawaii was organized as a Territory in 1900, that it too would be admitted as a State, the Territorial form of government being necessarily only a transitory one, to be followed by statehood as soon as the people of the Territory are capable of self-government, and

Whereas in the 50 years since annexation of Hawaii it has become a modern American community, with a sound economy and a healthy and literate people, who have shown themselves to be fully capable of self-government, and

Whereas the people of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question their loyalty and patriotism to the Government of the United States; and

Whereas several congressional committees during the past decade have reported to Congress that "the Territory of Hawaii has met every necessary requirement to be admitted as a State of the Union"; and

Whereas the people of Hawaii have served a satisfactory pupilage in the limited self-government permitted by the organic act of Congress, and desire the usual prerogatives of other American citizens—voting representation in the United States Congress, a vote for the President, and the selection of their own governor; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior and the President of the United States have unqualifiedly endorsed immediate statehood for Hawaii; and

Whereas by all the criteria used to determine public sentiment—newspaper support, public-opinion polls, endorsement by national organizations—Hawaii has received an overwhelming vote of confidence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Maui County Chamber of Commerce, That this organization endorse and it hereby goes on record as favoring immediate action by the Eighty-first Congress of the United States to enable Hawaii to be admitted as a State; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the chairman of the United States House of Representatives Committee on Public Lands, the Secretary of the Interior, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, the Governor of Hawaii, the Washington office of the Hawaii Statehood Commission (Suite 907, 740 Eleventh Street NW.), and the Honolulu office of the Hawaii Statehood Commission (P. O. Box 3775).

Dated this 25th day of April 1950.

We, the undersigned president and executive secretary, respectively, of the Maui County Chamber of Commerce, do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Maui County Chamber of Commerce at a duly called meeting thereof the 25th day of April 1950.

VICTOR L. SCHAEFER, JR., *President*.

EVELYN TAN, *Executive Secretary*.

MR. WOOLAWAY. I am Arthur D. Woolaway, in private life an official of the Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co., Ltd., which is the largest sugar plantation in the Nation on the island of Maui.

I am also a member of the Hawaii Statehood Commission and was elected to the Hawaii State constitutional convention, where I serve as vice president from the second senatorial district. I was born and raised in Hawaii, and since becoming of voting age I have been a Republican. I appear here today with deep citizen interest in statehood.

Gentlemen, it seems to me that the diversity of races in Hawaii is the main handicap in the eyes of Congress in our plea for statehood.

We feel the racial complexity of Hawaii is a tremendous asset to the United States. Our moral prestige as a nation among the other countries of the world is very high. The eyes of the peoples of the world are on us as never before.

Our democratic principles that preach equal rights regardless of race is the beacon of hope. However, unless we practice our democratic principles, we will lose our place of high standing in the eyes of the world by so much as we deviate from that practice.

Hawaii's progress in democracy and her plea for State government is a matter of interest throughout the Pacific world, as well as in Russia. However, this subject and others have been discussed thoroughly before this committee, so therefore I would like to continue by answering two pertinent questions that have been asked by members of this committee.

During this hearing, several members of this committee have indicated an interest in housing, and progress toward home ownership in the Territory. Senator Butler and Senator Cordon asked questions on this point.

Some testimony has been given by other witnesses but I believe it might be of interest to describe briefly the project that is well under way on the plantation of which I have some knowledge. This project is known as the Kahului development. The folks on the island of Maui call it the Dream City.

I would like to quote on the subject from the annual report of the Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co., Ltd., of 1948:

An important development of the year for the Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co., Ltd., community was the launching of a 25-year plan to develop a modern, small city on Maui, centering on the town of Kahului. If this small city develops as hoped—which of course must depend upon the continued prosperity of the area—it will eventually bring together the present 25 plantation communities, so that all may enjoy the benefits of modern urban living.

Our company, together with Kahului Railroad Co., nearly 2 years ago retained the services of Harland Bartholomew of Harland Bartholomew & Associates, St. Louis, to make a detailed independent study of our housing and living problems in central Maui, and tell us how best a new community could be designed.

Bartholomew & Associates are among America's leading city planners. They have designed cities and towns throughout continental United States. A year ago, we published Bartholomew's plan for a new Kahului, which will eventually occupy 3 square miles, centering on Kahului Harbor.

Our company has participated in the formation of the Kahului Development Co. which plans the construction of the first 198 new homes for sale or rent in 1949.

These homes will be of concrete and hollow-tile construction and thoroughly modern. During a 5-year period, it is hoped to construct 700 homes. The plan for Kahului allows for an eventual community of 4,000 homes, with modern business and shopping centers, schools, churches, playgrounds, and recreation facilities.

Fruition of this plan will require the full cooperation of many public and private groups. It is our hope that the new Kahului will develop in the best American traditions of independence, with an increasing number of residents owning their own homes.

In January of this year the new Kahului town housing project was described as the Nation's "outstanding" development by Franklin D. Richards, Director of the Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. Richards expressed this observation in an address before the Maui Rotary Club, of which I am a member, in January of this year. His remarks came after he had visited the project and had seen the first completed unit.

Accompanying Mr. Richards on this inspection trip were M. Joseph Cassidy, FHA western zone commissioner, and J. Stowell Wright, FHA director in Hawaii. Mr. Richards said:

That house in Kahului is absolutely the best of its kind I have seen in 15 years' experience as head of the FHA. I sincerely believe the Kahului home to represent the maximum in low-cost housing. There is nothing better in my experience in the continental United States, Alaska, Puerto Rico, or Hawaii.

The homes built with concrete tile are priced between \$7,100 and \$7,500. There are 17 different designs available. Each will have three bedrooms and a floor space of 1,090 square feet, plus a garage. And I would like to add that this price includes all the bathroom fixtures, the kitchen sink, laundry trays, clothesline, all the fixtures, including switches and floor plugs.

The price does not include the landscape or furniture or kitchen appliances. This landscape work was done under the direction of the University of Hawaii agricultural extension service, Maui branch.

Advice is available free of charge to any home owner. They are being built on fee-simple land and are being offered for sale to the general public and the employees of H. C. & S. & Kahului Railroad Co.

There has also been some concern as to bloc voting by race. In my own county, the county of Maui, consisting of three islands, namely Maui, Molakai, and Lanai, there is a total of twelve-thousand-odd voters. Of this total there are approximately 2,700 Caucasians, 350 Chinese, 180 Filipinos, 2,100 Hawaiians, 1,100 Part-Hawaiians, 5,200 Japanese, 31 Korean, 191 Puerto Ricans, and 450 others.

Eighty-six percent of the total registered voters elected nine delegates to the Hawaiian State constitutional convention now in session, six delegates to which are Caucasians, four being elected outright in the primary, including myself, one Hawaiian and two of Japanese ancestry.

Gentlemen, this is a good indication that the voters of Hawaii are responsible and mature.

Having fulfilled every reasonable condition for statehood, we ask you to judge us not by ancestry—an act of God—but by our contribution and asset as an integral part of the Nation.

As individuals, we, as Americans, profess to be of good Christian faith and champions of American principles. Let it not be said of the United States that our Nation adheres to principles of democracy only when it suits a purpose.

Will you then as Americans in good faith in the eyes of God and the nations of the world judge us by ancestry or by our contributions and loyalty as American citizens?

What justification can there be before our country and the nations of the world for denying us a logical promotion from the transitory status of a Territory to a permanent position of a State, a promotion in American tradition following precedents of American history?

The onus should be on the opponents of statehood. Unless they show good cause why Hawaii should not be a State to the satisfaction of this committee, I urge you to act favorably on our plea before you—in the eyes of God and the peoples of the world.

In closing, may I take advantage of this opportunity to express, on behalf of the people of Hawaii, their sincere gratitude and aloha for your kind consideration and the many others in high office in advancing immediate statehood for Hawaii.

I would like to give to the chairman of this committee, to be placed on file for your information, the designs of the various houses. I think some day Senator Butler, Senator Cordon, and the rest of you would like to come to Hawaii.

I can grant you that there are no better houses being built in the the Nation today.

Gentlemen, you cannot afford not to buy one.

Senator TAYLOR. You said you hoped Senator Butler and Senator Cordon would come to Hawaii. Democrats travel sometimes, too.

Mr. WOOLAWAY. Also, "the rest of you," I said. In fact, I extend an invitation to you, Senator, to visit me in my home.

(The designs filed may be found in the committee files.)

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would like to introduce former Senator Burke of Nebraska. He is the legal adviser of the Hawaiian Statehood Commission.

Senator TAYLOR. You are very well represented and we are happy to have you with us, Senator.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD R. BURKE, ESQ., LEGAL ADVISER, HAWAII STATEHOOD COMMISSION

Mr. BURKE. I have prepared a brief statement.

My name is Edward R. Burke. I am a lawyer by profession. My home is Omaha, Nebr., but I maintain a law office in Washington, also.

I appear as a witness representing the Hawaii Statehood Commission for which, during the past 3 years, I have served as legal adviser. It may be repeated that this is a governmental agency, established by act of the Territorial legislature. The members composing the commission are appointed by the Governor, subject to confirmation by the Territorial senate. Its expenses of operations are paid by appropriations out of tax funds. Its single purpose is to advance the cause of immediate statehood.

The question of statehood for Hawaii has been before the American people for a long time. In fact, it was almost 100 years ago that the first definite step was taken looking toward statehood. In 1854 the United States Commissioner to the Kingdom of Hawaii, acting under instructions from the Secretary of State, negotiated a treaty with the Hawaiian Foreign Minister. I would like to read one short article of that treaty:

The Kingdom of the Hawaiian Islands shall be incorporated into the American Union as a State, enjoying the same degree of sovereignty as other States, and admitted as such as soon as it can be done in consistency with the principles and requirements of the Federal Constitution, to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of a State as aforesaid, on a perfect equality with the other States of the Union.

As I have said, the treaty containing that provision was negotiated 96 years ago. Before action could be taken looking toward ratification, the Hawaiian ruler died. Certain foreign nations, England and France in particular, were opposed to permitting Hawaii to become a State in the American Union. The new ruler was more subject than his predecessor to this foreign influence, and the treaty was not ratified.

You are familiar with the treaty of annexation of 1898 and with the organic act of 1900, whereby Hawaii was "incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof."

There has been discussion before the committee as to the significance of incorporation of an organized Territory, and of the question whether such action can properly be interpreted as containing an implied promise of statehood, which might have moral, if not legal, weight in influencing your action. I feel sure that your discussion on passage of this enabling act will not rest on the basis of an implied promise arising out of incorporation of the Territory, or in any other manner. However, before stating what I am sure we will all agree is the real test, and before setting forth my conviction that Hawaii meets every requirement, I wish to explain why incorporation, and its implication, seems to us to be of importance.

In the course of the debates that culminated in the passage of the organic act of 1900, Senator Morgan (Alabama) said:

When I went out there under commission from the President, in company with my colleagues, one from the Senate, one from the House of Representatives, and two from Hawaii, after I had studied the system there during that visit and also the year previously, I became satisfied with the perfect truthfulness of the observation that these people had built up a government that was at least equal

in all respects to any government in the American Union. My first proposition was that we should recommend that the people of the Hawaiian Islands should hold a convention, adopt a constitution, and apply for admission into the American Union. * * * I still adhere to that as the opinion which I think is best entitled to be followed.

Later, Senator Morgan reverted to the same subject, saying:

I said to the Hawaiians, when I first went there, "If you want justice in the Government of the United States, stand your ground and apply for admission as a State into the American Union, where your Senators can come upon this floor, and in the other House your Representatives can come and take care of your interests."

Hawaii did not follow the advice of Senator Morgan and insist upon coming into the Union as a State at once. It seems to me fair to assume that they were influenced in reaching that decision by many utterances in the Senate and in the House, of which the following is typical. I quote Representative Hill (Connecticut):

The American people look upon the authorization and full organization of a Territory as the first step toward statehood. It has always been so construed; it always will be so construed.

The people of Hawaii could well have believed, that since incorporation was declared to be the first step toward statehood, they could with safety accept the Territorial status for a limited time.

It was not only in the legislative branch of Government that the doctrine was expounded that incorporation of a Territory is a definite step toward statehood. The courts have fully agreed. Reference to a single decision will suffice as the point is not in dispute. In *Balzac v. Puerto Rico* (258 U. S. 298), decided in 1921, an attempt was made to infer an intention on the part of Congress to give Puerto Rico the status of an incorporated Territory, although no specific and definite act having that purpose could be shown. Chief Justice Taft delivered the opinion of the Court, in which he said:

We need not dwell on another consideration which requires us not lightly to infer from acts thus easily explained on other grounds, an intention to incorporate in the Union these distant ocean communities of a different origin and language from those of our continental people. Incorporation has always been a step, and an important one, leading to statehood. Without, in the slightest degree, intimating an opinion as to the wisdom of such a policy, for that is not our province, it is reasonable to assume that when such a step is taken, it will be begun and taken by Congress deliberately and with a clear declaration of purpose, and not left a matter of mere inference or construction.

I have spent some time on this phase of the matter not with the thought that you will conclude that because incorporation is a step toward statehood you must take the remaining steps and grant statehood now. Nor is it my purpose to emphasize an implied promise of statehood in order that you may be induced to fulfill the moral obligation of granting full statehood at this time.

What has been said offers complete refutation, it seems to me, of the argument that you should not grant statehood to Hawaii now because that would establish a precedent which would make it difficult for you to refuse statehood to any other noncontiguous territory that might apply—Puerto Rico, Guam, or even Newfoundland, as one of your colleagues has argued.

In the first place, if a precedent is established, it would not be in any way binding upon this committee or upon Congress. As stated by members of the committee, you must decide each case upon its own

merits. But so far as there is any precedent, it would not be established by the final act of admission now of Hawaii as a State. The precedent was established 50 years ago when Congress saw fit to incorporate the noncontiguous Territory of Hawaii into the United States as an integral part thereof and by such action put the Territory on the road to statehood.

Hawaii and Alaska are the only incorporated Territories. They are, therefore, the only Territories in line for statehood. I firmly believe that Congress should never incorporate any other territory—in other words, that there is no other territory that should be put in line for statehood. It may well be that the strongest deterrent to any such action by a future Congress will be the clear demonstration now that the ultimate result of incorporation is of necessity statehood. You will furnish that proof by your action in completing the process of making Hawaii a State.

In spite of all that may be said about the effect of incorporation, and of an implied promise of statehood, I readily concede that the duty and responsibility of this committee is to decide whether Hawaii now possesses the essential requirements that an incorporated Territory should have before it is entitled to admission as a State.

If you find that it does have those qualifications your decision then must turn on whether the granting of statehood to Hawaii will, in your judgment, further the best interests of the United States.

When you have heard the remaining witnesses who will testify at this hearing, and when you have examined the very voluminous record that has been built up over the years, I have no doubt that you will report H. R. 49 favorably, and will exert your effort to see that final action is taken at this session of Congress.

I will take of your time in conclusion only a few moments to state my firm conviction, which rests upon a long period of consideration of the question.

In 1935 a committee of the House after extensive hearings reported that it "found the Territory of Hawaii to be a modern unit of the American commonwealth, with a political, social, and economic structure of the highest type" (74th Cong., 1st sess.).

In 1937 the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House each appointed 12 members of a joint committee that held extensive hearings in Hawaii. It was my privilege to be a member of that committee, headed by the late Senator King of Utah. Among those who took an active part in the investigation were the distinguished chairman of this committee, Senator O'Mahoney—also, Senators Connally, Tydings, and Gillette. Although the members of the committee very generally felt that Hawaii had then fulfilled every requirement for statehood, it recommended that, because of the disturbed condition of international affairs, final decision on the question of statehood should be postponed.

Since that date there have been a number of other investigations. The general conclusion has been that Hawaii now meets every requirement for statehood. This is based on a study of population, material resources and wealth, the stability of its economic structure, its demonstrated ability for self-government, its loyalty to American ideals, its devotion to public education, and its faithful adherence to the basic freedom of religion, speech, and press.

The reasons that caused the Secretary of State 100 years ago to believe that Hawaii as a State would add to the general welfare and security of the Union are now accentuated manyfold. The tide of events has forced the United States into a position of world leadership. We have an interest and concern in the Far East beyond the vision of the most farsighted statesman of that earlier period.

Even were it legally possible to disincorporate the Territory of Hawaii, and permit it to become the possession of a foreign power, or to attempt to reestablish and maintain itself as an independent republic, there is none so foolish as to consider such a course. The fortunes of Hawaii and of mainland United States, are bound together by ties that can never be sundered.

American citizens in Hawaii, since its incorporation as a Territory, have paid into the Federal Treasury, more than a billion dollars in taxes. Yet in the imposition of those taxes, and in the appropriation of the funds, these fellow citizens of ours have had no voice. Taxation without representation never was popular anywhere on American soil.

Thousands of American citizens who happen to live in Hawaii have been drafted or have volunteered to serve in the Armed Forces of our common country at home and on foreign battlefields. Surely they are entitled to a vote in the Congress which alone can declare war. They should have the right to help select the President who is to be their Commander in Chief. They ought to be given the opportunity to actively participate in the shaping of policies which may bring a lasting peace.

Finally, Hawaii offers the finest example under the flag of a community composed of peoples of diverse racial stocks who have somehow found the way to live and work together in harmony and with mutual understanding. Senators and Representatives coming to the Halls of Congress by choice of the citizens of Hawaii, familiar with its problems and with its aspirations, will have a real contribution to make to the Nation's welfare.

Now that I am here, I would like to say one word on this question of the significance of incorporation.

Senator Malone is not here. I would like to take very sharp issue with the position he took this morning. His position, as I understood it, was that if you now grant statehood to Hawaii you have no adequate reason for refusing statehood to Puerto Rico, Guam, and even Ireland, I believe he said.

It seems to me that a statement of that position cannot be substantiated. I do not argue for one moment that because Hawaii was incorporated as an organized Territory 50 years ago, and because there were some direct and implied promises of statehood in the future, that that is the problem before this committee.

I think it has its significance. But this committee very clearly has just two things to do in answering this question: Does Hawaii meet the requirements of an organized Territory to be admitted into the Union?

The evidence is overwhelming that every single requirement is fully met.

The second and most important question of all, to my mind, is: Would the addition of Hawaii as a State be for the general best interests of this country?

I would like to say this about Senator Malone's position: I think the incorporation of Hawaii as a Territory will have very great significance. In the debates of both Houses of Congress at that time it was made very clear that if the Congress were to take that step and incorporate the Territory of Hawaii, it having already been annexed, that statehood was the ultimate objective. And it doesn't depend only on what was said in Congress. It was already referred to that at that time a representative from Congress—Congressman Hill—offered an amendment to the organic act in the House, which would provide in specific terms that the granting of incorporation would not be any pledge of statehood.

He elaborated upon the point very fully, stating that it had always been understood, and as he said, always would be understood, that incorporation was the first step toward statehood, unless some other action was taken, so he was opposed to Hawaii being a State.

He wanted to write right into the provision that nothing in the passage of that act should be interpreted as being a pledge of statehood. The House voted him down by an overwhelming majority. They wanted the same provision to prevail. I understand that the then Senator Lodge of Massachusetts was prepared to offer the same kind of an amendment in the Senate, but after the reception in the House the amendment was not offered.

So it has been recognized by the legislative branch of the Government that when you incorporate a Territory you hold out statehood as the ultimate objective to which that Territory is entitled.

I do not qualify my other statement that that does not mean that now or at any other time you are under obligation. The Congress of the United States is the complete judge at all times as to whether the qualifications have been met. You can use your own judgment on that point now or at any time.

But the significance of incorporation did this: It removed when Hawaii was incorporated as a Territory the objection that noncontiguity is a permanent bar to statehood. To that extent a precedent was established.

What would be the effect now of carrying that out and granting statehood? It would not be the establishment of a precedent but rather it would be notice to all future Congresses that if they incorporated a Territory they are going to wind up by making a State sometime.

So when Puerto Rico, if it ever does—I do not think it ever will apply for organization as a Territory—if it does, Congress would have to make its decision then: Will we follow the precedent established in the case of Hawaii 50 years ago and incorporate this Territory?

You would be the full judges of whether you would want to do that, and I doubt very much that Congress would ever want to incorporate any other Territory.

So that I see no particular force to the argument as made.

I want to refer also to the fact that this is not only legislative determination that incorporation is the first step toward statehood, but in a number of court decisions—I will refer only to one, the case of *Balzac v. Puerto Rico*, decided in 1921, found in 258 United States at page 298—Chief Justice Taft rendered the decision of the Supreme Court.

The issue involved in the case was whether the Constitution extended in all of its provisions to Puerto Rico. It was a criminal case. Counsel for appellant in that case argued that while there was no specific act of Congress to which reference could be made which granted incorporation to Puerto Rico, yet a large number of other acts indicated a clear intention, an implied incorporation.

Chief Justice Taft disposed of that argument very fully. He said:

This is such a serious matter, the incorporation of a noncontiguous Territory, composed of people of different racial extractions, that it would not be implied but must be directly expressed by Congress.

And then he used this expression:

The incorporation of a Territory is a step and a very important step toward statehood.

So that I say the effect now of carrying out the necessary consequences of having incorporated Hawaii 50 years ago is merely giving notice to all future sessions of Congress that if they want to incorporate Puerto Rico, if they want to incorporate Guam, or if they want to incorporate any other of our island possessions, they should do so with their eyes open if that means that eventually you will be asked to take in another State.

My opinion is that no Congress of the United States is ever going to be confronted with the matter of taking in any more States except the two matters that are now before this committee: Hawaii and Alaska.

I think that the evidence presented here during this week, coupled with the evidence of the hearings to which Senator Cordon referred and offered an index for this record, ought to be convincing to every one that Hawaii ought now to be admitted into the sisterhood of States on an equality with the rest of the States.

Thank you very much.

Senator TAYLOR. Senator Cordon?

Senator CORDON. Not a word. I have discussed it with the Senator before.

Mr. BURKE. Senator Cordon and Senator Butler, in fact, most of the Senators, have discussed the matter with me at some length.

Senator BUTLER. You have not discussed it with any of the Senators, have you, Senator?

Mr. BURKE. I would say this: I have discussed it on every possible occasion with my dear friend, the Senator from Nebraska, and that I am still in very great hope—maybe you will accuse me of being an optimist—that when this matter comes on the floor of the Senate, H. R. 49, amended in any particulars that you see fit, will have the strong and active support of the Senator from Nebraska.

Senator BUTLER. You might tell the people—maybe they do not all know—that you and I both come from Nebraska.

Mr. BURKE. We not only come from Nebraska, but Senator Butler and I lived in the city of Omaha. We have been intimate friends and associates for a great many years. We had the pleasure of serving together on the school board of Omaha for a number of years; we belong to the same church; we attended the same kind of college—he the Congregational College and I at a similar college in Beloit, Wis.—and we see eye to eye on practically all matters.

For that reason I have not given up hope of having Senator Butler on my side.

Senator TAYLOR. Thank you, Senator Burke.

Mr. BURKE. It has been a pleasure to be before you.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES HAROLD SILVA, D. D. S., MEMBER OF TERRITORIAL SENATE FROM HAWAII

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Silva, of Hawaii.

I will ask you to make a brief statement and file your prepared statements for the record.

Mr. SILVA. I would be glad to do that, Delegate Farrington.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Our witnesses from Hawaii are eloquent speakers and I do not want to be the instrumentality for cutting off their time, but I am under pressure to use what influence I have to do that very thing.

Mr. SILVA. To expedite matters I will file this brief statement which I have prepared, with a few amendments I have made. I hope that you will have time to look over this brief statement.

(The statement is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF CHARLES HAROLD SILVA, D. D. S., MEMBER OF TERRITORIAL SENATE FROM HAWAII

Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, my name is Charles Harold Silva. My profession is doctor of dental surgery. I am a member of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii and I have served in the Senate since 1935, a period of four terms, and am the leading Republican senator in point of continued service. I have served on every committee of the senate, either as a member or its chairman.

I am an American of Portuguese ancestry, born in the Hawaiian Islands. My grandparents were some of the earliest settlers of Massachusetts and I have a large string of relatives thereabouts that I have never met as yet.

I am not a Communist. My interest in statehood is a personal one and I believe that I speak for a good number of Americans in Hawaii, whose views are the same as mine. I wish to assure this committee that I have no fear of the racial complexity of the Americans in the Territory of Hawaii.

Prior to the Republican caucus for the organization of the 1949 session of the Territorial Legislature, I approached Senator Wilfred Tsukiyama, a veteran of the First World War and a good friend of mine, and asked him to consider the presidency of the senate, feeling, of course, that he was the most qualified.

My purpose was to move him out of the chairmanship of the judiciary committee, place Senator Hill in his seat, and take Senator Hill's seat as chairman of the ways and means committee. In the caucus that followed, I was chosen president of the senate by all of the members present but declined the honor and suggested Senator Wilfred Tsukiyama for that office. I ran into opposition from Senator Toshio Ansai, another American of Japanese ancestry and a disabled veteran of the Second World War. Both of these men are here. The record will show that my suggestion carried.

Those present at the caucus were Senators Ben Dillingham, William J. Norbriga, Neal Blaisdell, Toshio Ansai, William H. Hill, Eugene S. Capellas, and myself. I mention this because of my 16 years as a Senator, I am proud to say that Senator Tsukiyama has been most outstanding as president of the Territorial senate. As a result of his accomplishments in government, Coe College of Iowa rewarded him with the honorary degree of doctor of law.

I also have the highest regard for Senator Toshio Ansai, who volunteered in the Second World War and became disabled in combat. Senator Ansai and I appeared before a congressional committee 13 years ago, investigating the status of Hawaii for statehood. I believe the chairman of this committee, Senator O'Mahoney, was present then.

The alien oriental is fast disappearing. Their children, Americans, are as good as myself. I expect no more, no less of our Government. I only point this out because Secretary Chapman of the Department of Interior in his address on the opening day of this hearing gave me the impression that perhaps some

of the members of this committee were concerned about the question of the Japanese. I wish to thank you for this privilege, perhaps the climax of my political career.

Mr. SILVA. I would like at this moment to defend my stand as far as the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act is concerned. In fact I have served in the Territorial senate and I am a leading Republican senator in the Territorial legislature in point of service—16 years, or 4 terms.

I would like to say, gentlemen, that in all those years I have strongly supported the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. There is no doubt, I believe, in Mr. Farrington's mind nor Mr. Houston's nor Mr. Sam King's, that my good friend's—William Nobriga, the Senator from the first senatorial district—argument has some merit.

Only I say that it is not timed properly. It may take 8 or 10 years before we can put Mr. Nobriga's ideas into effect, maybe longer.

I want to point out that the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act was created 30 years ago, in 1920. Then for a period of 8 or 9 years there was a lull, there weren't sufficient funds. The Commission at that time appointed to administer the act was very lax indeed. You will find there were large leases made which took 2 years for these lands again to be made available for the Hawaiians.

We have had various commissions all along, and in those commissions you will find men who were under the influence, one way or the other, of some of the large leaseholders.

Senator TAYLOR. That is what we feared. That is why we asked these questions.

Mr. SILVA. I will point those things out to you. About 1944 or 1945 the Commission began to change. This last Commission we have now has quite a number of members of Hawaiian blood. They have been very active in getting these lands for the Hawaiians.

As I say, these Hawaiian people must be given a chance. They were not given a chance in the past. But I assure you, as the introducer of the amendment that gave the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act the \$350,000 in the Territorial legislature in 1947—I did it on the floor of the senate—that will make available water for this large project, these 11,000 acres which prior to that time were under the control of the Parker ranch.

Water will soon come into that area, and I have done everything I can to have Hawaiians homestead that particular area and go into ranching. The Homes Commission has been doing everything possible to make the land available for the Hawaiians. The latest information I have is that the applicants for the 11,000 acres—for the lots and the ranches, the small homestead lots for agriculture, and those for ranches running about 250 or 300 acres—there is an overwhelming number of applicants right now for those lots.

I say in all sincerity within the next 15 or 20 years, with a commission such as we have now, and will have in the future, you are going to find some rapid strides in the rehabilitation of the Hawaiian.

Senator ECTON. Who appointed the commissioners?

Mr. SILVA. The Governor, confirmed by the senate. We have had a tremendous change in politics in the Hawaiian Islands. The influence in the past was very, very much under the control, as in Butte, Mont., of the Anaconda Copper Co.—I am just saying what happened in the past—and you will find in Hawaii the same thing, in the past

the big interests had a big control. But the control has slipped out of their hands in the last 15 or 20 years and has gone more to the people.

You will find that Governor Stainback has been very independent and has made a strong appeal to the interests in the islands to release some of the lands for homestead, for house lots, and they are doing that now.

I wanted to point that out to you. These leases had 21 years to go. No one got in there, as far as members of the Commission, to try to do anything about it because the members were influenced by the big interests. I am talking about the big ranches.

Today you have a different Commission entirely. They are doing everything possible to rehabilitate the Hawaiians. I can assure you that within the next 20 years you will find a very, very strong Hawaiian rehabilitation project in this area.

MR. FARRINGTON. I would like to present Senator Akana, the only woman member of our senate, if I may.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR THELMA AKANA, MEMBER OF THE TERRITORIAL SENATE

Mrs. AKANA. I do not have a prepared statement, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

I am of Caucasian, Hawaiian, and Chinese ancestry. My Chinese ancestry dates back to a lone Chinese member of a crew on a sandlewood sampan who was shipwrecked on the island of Oahu before the first group of Chinese were brought into Hawaii in 1850. He landed there in 1843 and died in 1927, a little over 108 years of age. He was a man and he had to have a wife, and there were no Chinese women on the island so he did the natural thing—he married a Hawaiian woman. That is how he got into my family.

The Hawaiian strain I trace back to Kokuape, the man who was the captain of the armies of Kamehameha, who had great influence over the chiefs and who selected Kamehameha to be the first reigning monarch in that dynasty.

On my father's side, they came to Pittsburgh when Pittsburgh was Fort Pitt. They emigrated to the United States from England. My father came to Hawaii. He was on his way to Manila on the U. S. S. *Charleston* to fight in the Spanish-American War. He was on the U. S. S. *Charleston* when it sunk in Manila Bay. On his way home he met my mother and never got any further. He stayed there and I am the result, and of course, two other sisters.

As to education, I have had 12 years of schooling, both elementary, intermediate and high school, spent in an Episcopal Girls' School. From there I went to the St. Luke's School of Nursing in San Francisco, graduated from there and then to the University of San Francisco and studied nursing. I was the first public health nurse on the Island of Molokai where the Hawaiian homes project was under way.

I was there in 1937. Then Secretary of the Interior Herbert Worth came there. I would like to substantiate the fact that the Hawaiian Homes Commission went through a great period of trial and error which was natural. There were people who knew nothing about homesteading. They were on the Commission, some with good in-

tentions and some, being human, had weak intentions. People were put on land without a dependable and adequate source of water—there were people on land where they did not have good roads.

If you knew Molakai as I did from being a public health nurse, and having to change tires, and sometimes you could not get into a place, the mud was so thick. I was also a sanitary inspector.

With a history like that it is no wonder that the Hawaiian homes had to go through a period of very great tribulation and trials for these people, who, to begin with, had to learn something about farming. I bring this in because I know that from public experience. I was the first Public Health nurse on that island. I worked for 11 years for the Territorial Board of Health. In the meantime I went back to the Columbia University and studied supervision and administration in the field of public health nursing.

When I resigned in 1939 I was the Assistant Director of the Bureau of Public Health Nursing. In the meantime my husband began to earn enough money to take care of us and went into politics. He was the chairman of the Finance Board of Honolulu for 6 years and was elected to the Senate in 1940. He died in 1943—10 days before the session ended—at the age of 40 and he had given all he could.

He was president of one of the attorney hearing boards. He had no right to do as much work as he did because he had very bad cardiac trouble. But he had to do it with everybody else doing their share.

In 1944 I decided to run for the Senate. I had done a great deal of voluntary work. I was president of the Hawaii Tuberculosis Association, affiliated with the national tuberculosis association. I was president of the Nurses Association of Hawaii for 6 years, which is an affiliate of the American Nurses Association. I am also a member of many other national health organizations such as the American Public Health Association and the National Society of Mental Hygiene and so forth. I ran for the Senate in 1944, and was elected for a 4-year term and then ran again in 1948 and was reelected. I served on the finance committee and was chairman of the health committee for the past three sessions of the Senate. I have been vice president of the Senate for the past two sessions of the Senate. I have been on the education committee and on the county committee for matters that deal with our respective county matters. I am a Republican, and by choice.

I would like to say to you I know that you have just masses of material to go over. I have a son who left the same night that I came here, to go to work on the atomic energy project somewhere in the South Pacific. He is 21 years of age and he is on his way. And I have three other children. For them I hope I can go home and say, "We at last have gotten what I have told you all these years every American will finally get and what you will finally get after 50 years of tutelage in the American way of life."

I cannot help but believe that after you have read all this material, after you have considered what we can contribute to the international situation in the way of extending the democratic frontier—and gentlemen, I do not speak without knowledge, I was in Manila in November, I was there for only 2 weeks and I was called upon to talk about the situation in America, with regard to the way we lived, and what they could do out there before the Rotarians and the Nurses' Association, and before the National Federation of Women's Clubs composed of representatives of 500 women's clubs.

Just before I left for here, I had a citation from them for the services I had rendered, because I firmly believe that we have a great deal to contribute in the promotion of international peace and in the understanding and in assisting these new democracies in the East and living the way we have lived, after our tie-up with America.

In Korea there is a girl from Honolulu named Esther Park who is doing a marvelous job. It was in Hawaii that Sygman Rhe was protected during the days he needed protection. It was in Hawaii that Sun Yat Sen went to school. You cannot say that an island such as ours has not made a marvelous contribution to the promotion of democracy in that it has sent for the people who after all are the things that count in this world. They have sent for the people who have made a marvelous contribution in promoting the democratic way of life.

I cannot see and I cannot believe that every one of you will not vote for statehood for Hawaii when you count the things that we can contribute to our Nation. We are willing to contribute not only in money but particularly in services, because we want to raise our children for a pleasant life and not for future cannon fodder.

I thank you very much. I hope I can go home and say I am wrong about Senator Butler. I hope I can say that, that I am really wrong about you, and believe that you will vote for statehood.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Senator Neal Blaisdell, of the island of Oahu.

STATEMENT OF NEAL BLAISDELL, MEMBER OF THE TERRITORIAL SENATE FROM OAHU

Mr. BLAISDELL. I want to file a brief statement with you, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee.

I am Neal Blaisdell, as the Delegate just mentioned. I am a native of the islands. I am of Scotch-Irish and Hawaiian descent. I am a member of the territorial senate and personnel director of the Hawaiian Pineapple Co., plant division.

You have heard others testify to the economic and political justification for granting statehood to Hawaii now. I do not think I can add anything more to what has already been said. I have attempted to develop here the phase dealing with labor and management relationships in Hawaii. We, the people of Hawaii, ask only one thing, your most serious and sympathetic consideration, and that is that you fulfill our plea for statehood now.

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you. I do say in all sincerity that we have worked constantly, sincerely, and untiringly to qualify ourselves for statehood. We feel statehood is due us now and we ask you to give us that which we consider our just dues. Thank you very much.

(The supplemental statement of Neal Blaisdell is as follows:)

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF NEAL BLAISDELL, MEMBER OF THE TERRITORIAL SENATE FROM OAHU

My name is Neal Blaisdell. I am a native of the islands and am of Scotch-Irish-Hawaiian descent. I am a member of the Territorial senate and am personnel director for the processing division of the Hawaiian Pineapple Co. I was educated in the Catholic school system, the University of Hawaii, and Bucknell University of Pennsylvania.

You have heard others testify to the economic and political justification for granting statehood to Hawaii now. I would just like to add my testimony to theirs but in personal terms.

My personal experience includes experience in business, government, athletics, and schools. In all of these, except government, I have had direct personal experience on the mainland as well as in Hawaii. From that basis of personal knowledge and comparison I am firmly convinced that Hawaii is ready for statehood now and that it should be granted now.

From this combination of experiences, I can testify to the basic good character and good sportsmanship of Hawaiian youth. Sportsmanship, to me, is part of the fundamental training of young people for responsibility in a democracy. They learn team play, cooperation, fairness, respect for rules of the game, and respect for the other fellow.

I know that the people of Hawaii have it. They are no different from young people on the mainland, and because of the many racial groups of Hawaii, they learn racial cooperation early in life and it stays with them throughout their lives.

As to my work as plant personnel director of the Hawaiian Pineapple Co., I have visited many companies on the mainland to observe their industrial-relations work. I have attended a training session of Industrial Relations Counselors of New York at which were present management representatives from a large number of mainland industrial firms. Other members of my staff have done the same. The Industrial Relations Counselors have made a survey of our company, comparing it with mainland firms. From this experience, I know that our relationship between management and labor rank with the best on the mainland. Few are better, a lot are worse.

We have the same union in the Hawaiian Pineapple Co. as do most of the businesses in Hawaii; that is, the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union, yet we have a constructive and harmonious relationship with our employees and their union representatives.

Most attention to union matters in Hawaii has been given to a few top officials in the ILWU. Most of these officials to whom such attention has been given are not directly representative of Hawaii. They were sent out from the mainland under instructions and have continued to be controlled from the mainland. The publicity attached to these men obscures the fact that most workers in Hawaii and their chosen representatives are of solid good character.

As an example of the healthy state of labor relations in our company, I would like to mention the recent election of the president of our company to the constitutional convention. He, a Republican, was elected outright in the primary election from a district composed primarily of Democrats who usually voted a Democratic ticket. His most active supporters and campaigners were company employees, many of whom were strong union men. Their participation in the campaign was entirely voluntary.

Another example I would like to mention is that in one unit of our company we have an established labor-management committee in which labor and management representatives meet at frequent intervals to discuss the common problems encountered on the job and to work out together common solutions to those problems.

The point I wish to make in mentioning these examples is this: Most workers in Hawaii, including those in the ILWU, are sensible, fair, and very capable. The public squabbles surrounding some of their leaders does not detract from that fact. To overlook the good sense and loyalty of the majority of the workers would be doing them a serious injustice and would give a completely erroneous picture of the labor situation in Hawaii.

I would like also to mention my experience in government. As a member of the Territorial senate, I am chairman of the Oahu select committee which has general supervision of matters relating to the city and county of Honolulu. Consequently I am acquainted with municipal government as well as Territorial.

The ability of Hawaii to govern itself has in the last 10 years been given a rough and tough test and we have passed that test.

First, preparation for war, then war itself. Thousands of new workers were brought into the Territory from every State of the Union. Tens of thousands of servicemen came in. Severe strain and disruption of civilian economy occurred. Tremendous problems of civilian government and coordination with military authorities were encountered. The community problems of receiving all of these new people of different interests and backgrounds were most difficult.

During much of this time there were also continuing problems of civilian and military defense, black-outs, curfews, the continual pressure of providing logistic support to military forces, et cetera. But Hawaii adapted itself to this situation quickly, and carried its heavy share of responsibility well.

Then at the close of the war the problems of reconversion, demobilization, return to peacetime activities occurred. This was complicated by the progressive curtailment of military and civil service payrolls in Hawaii forcing the load of displaced Government employees onto the Territory. I am not complaining about this, you understand, but simply mentioning it as a real problem of government.

Then, in the midst of this postwar turmoil, an attempt was made to capture the government of Hawaii by the ILWU. It was a well-timed affair coming when all attention was of necessity concentrated in other directions.

Unions have a perfectly legitimate right to engage in political activities. I support that fully; but I am also sure that Phil Murray and Representative Walter will agree with me when I say that the political activities of the ILWU have not always been legitimate.

But the important point is this: Hawaii successfully resisted that attempt to capture its government while at the same time maintaining a stable and effective government; meeting its postwar problems well and moving ahead with plans for the future.

In saying this, I want to make clear that I am not talking about the normal activities of established political parties. What I am talking about is the obligation of any government to resist capture by a special-interest group which seeks control of government only to further its own selfish ends.

Knowing the young people of Hawaii, the workers, management men, government officials, being one of the Hawaiian people myself and knowing how we compare with people in the rest of the country, I know as surely as I know that the sun will rise tomorrow that we are ready for statehood.

We have as a people worked for 50 years to qualify ourselves for what we consider our most cherished heritage—incorporation as full members with equal rights as your States, gentlemen, in the sisterhood of States. We the people of Hawaii are intensely imbued with the spirit of democracy and because of that spirit we are prepared to fight for what we consider is rightfully ours.

We come here as elected representatives of the people of Hawaii, people of every racial extraction under the sun. We representatives assembled here today are of many racial extractions but our thoughts are one and our purpose uniform.

It is easy for us to become emotional about this question though we would like to restrain our emotions at a hearing such as this. However, I do want to mention it as my concluding thought for this reason.

Our emotions reflect our spirit. This is not something which can be proven by mathematical figures or demonstrated on charts but it is of fundamental importance. From missionary days to the present day, we in Hawaii have had a strong religious spirit. We feel strongly the spirit of American democracy. We are closer in history to pioneer days than many of the older States so that the pioneering spirit is still very much with us. All these things come from and are in harmony with the historical spirit of the American people. It is that spirit which has made America great.

That spirit moves us to make this presentation of our case to you for granting statehood to Hawaii now. We feel strongly about it as well as think clearly about it.

We feel that statehood will be beneficial not only to Hawaii, but to the Nation as well. We want to, and are able to, stand on our own feet. We also want to and are able to stand shoulder to shoulder with the other States doing our part to further the programs of the Nation.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Senator Lee, of the island of Oahu.

STATEMENT OF HERBERT K. H. LEE, MEMBER OF THE TERRITORIAL SENATE FROM OAHU

Mr. LEE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to congratulate the Delegate for putting the senators around the end because when the senators get started talking they never end.

My name is Herbert Lee, age 37, married, with two children. I am an American citizen of Chinese ancestry, born of immigrant

parents, who came to the Hawaiian Islands as laborers. Like many of my colleagues who have appeared before you, I am a product of the public-school system.

After graduating from the University of Michigan Law School at Ann Arbor, Mich., in 1939, I returned to Hawaii and entered government service, serving the people as a deputy public prosecutor and later as a deputy attorney general.

In 1943 I entered private law practice and have continued in that capacity up to this date. Like many of the good Americans who have appeared before you, I chose to serve my government and was elected to the Territorial house of representatives in 1944, and again in 1946, on the Democratic ticket.

Elected to the senate in 1948, I am now a holdover senator serving the legislative holdover committee as its chairman of the civil-service classification and retirement subcommittee. I am also a member of the constitutional convention now drawing up the proposed constitution for the State of Hawaii.

As a member of this delegation, I would like to urge the immediate enactment of H. R. 49 for the reasons already presented before your committee. Gentlemen, the amazing thing about our case is the unanimous desire of all segments in our population for statehood, including Republicans, Democrats, Conservatives, Liberals, middle-of-the-roads, and members of all races. Truly, the principles of democracy have paid dividends as exemplified by the members of our delegation.

Let us not therefore hesitate. Show the world that America not only preaches democracy, but actually practices democracy.

Most of the legislators who are here could learn a lot by what has occurred here before this Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. To see the patience on the part of the Senators here, those who believe or are opposed to statehood, giving attention and time to matters so that they can really form a decision should the bill be reported out on the floor.

I would like to say that that has been one of my jobs as a minority member, always in the minority group in the senate and in the house, in which I served for 2 years and now in the senate 2 years—to probe it and investigate into the matters. I believe with all this testimony which has been presented before this committee there is very little more that I can add.

To say, also, that this amazing thing that I noticed, when we gathered here over 50 strong, is the unanimous desire of all segments of our population, whether Republicans, Democrats, Liberals, middle-of-the-roads, radicals, or otherwise, they all seemed to feel that the principal of self-determination is the thing here, and that we have worked for statehood. It is not the kind of thing that is handed to us on a silver platter.

I have watched Joe Farrington here working his heart out, and it has made the rest of us appreciate our part in this great movement. Although we would like considerably more time expand on our qualifications, I feel that I would be helping statehood if I conclude now.

Thank you.

MR. FARRINGTON. The next member of the senate we want to present is a cattleman from the island of Kauai, Senator Manuel Aguiar.

STATEMENT OF MANUEL R. AGUIAR, JR., MEMBER, TERRITORIAL SENATE, HAWAII

MR. AGUIAR. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have a typewritten statement here which gives more detail than the little handwritten statement I have here. That explains how I came to the earth, perhaps, but this one gives an idea of how I live.

My name is Manuel R. Aguiar. The "R" is for Rodrigues. I am a senator from the fourth senatorial district. I am a small sugarcane planter producing an average of about 100 tons of sugar a year. I have been doing this since 1914.

I am the only independent sugar planter outside of the Big Five. All the other small planters in the Territory are called "adherent planters." I finance myself.

I am also a small cattle rancher running a herd of mixed breeds of about 140 heads producing about 24,000 pounds of beef a year. I take great pride in that. I challenge every cattle producer in the Territory and they cannot beat me.

Senator BUTLER. Where is the market?

MR. AGUIAR. I sell it right at home. I never have any trouble. I never clip the grass. I put some fertilizer in and the meat is so good they buy it and no questions are asked.

My production per acre of pasture is over 150 pounds of beef per year per acre. I challenge all the ranchers, and they cannot beat it. The record says I am the champion.

Senator BUTLER. Do you have alfalfa?

MR. AGUIAR. No alfalfa, just plain kukia grass that came from Africa.

I paid my way in this government. I worked for it, and I paid my way. When I am not engaged in politics as now, I do about half of the work on the farm. Of course when I come here I cannot work. The farm area is about 180 acres. It is owned in fee simple by the family. There are three daughters and a very good wife in the family.

I want to say that I represent all the small farmers in the Territory of Hawaii. I belong to a number of organizations and I want to say here that I claim to be their spokesman. There are over 4,000 small farmers in Hawaii farming from one acre up to 200. I do not include the men above 200 acres.

Everyone of these farmers are 100 percent for statehood and there are no ifs about it. We feel that the way things are run now with the executive and the judiciary heads selected by appointment, the best brains of the Territory of Hawaii are not put in command of those two top positions in our government.

We feel that if these two governmental department heads—I do not mean only the two heads, there are a number of heads below that—were filled—

Senator TAYLOR. Speaking as a cattleman?

MR. AGUIAR. Yes, sir; I am speaking as a cattleman. We feel that if these heads were filled by a free election of our people, problems that arise in Hawaii could be more properly solved. That has been my experience. I have been in politics for 30 years. I held a number of different offices. The only thing I have not been in Hawaii is the governor.

But I am not looking for it. I know that the people have the qualifications to put the best man or the best material in office, and that is what we farmers ask for, the opportunity to put these men in office that we must have at the head—I mean the executive and the judiciary.

Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, we want statehood. If you cannot give us statehood, give us something better than we have now. Give us the right to elect our governor, give us the right to determine who our judges shall be. Reduce or eliminate our Federal income taxes. If you cannot give us statehood you certainly ought to cut down the percentage on this income tax.

Senator BUTLER. I believe you are a farmer.

Mr. AGUIAR. I am a farmer. And please do not be too harsh on the Democratic Party. I am a Democrat. They are now going through a process of the pains of birth that everything goes through. That is the truth about it.

There was no Democratic Party in Hawaii from 1922 to 1932. I ran the Democratic Party in Kauai and could only get 10 people to sign the roll. "I am a Democrat, but if I sign the roll," they say, "I will be fired."

Four years ago the labor people joined the Democratic Party and they are going now through the pains of birth. That is the truth. Without the labor people there will be no Democratic Party.

The Democratic Party before that time only existed to receive the plums that fell from Washington. That is the truth. So I ask you gentlemen to go easy, do not be too harsh with the Democrats in Hawaii. They will come out all right.

There are a few Communists over there, but the moment the labor people or the Democratic Party finds who are the Communists, we will kick them clean out of the place. You do not have to worry. They came from here, though.

Senator BUTLER. Near the close of the witness' statement, he said if we do not give them statehood to give them something else. I was the author of the bill that became law permitting Puerto Rico to elect their own governor, and to run all of their own affairs. I think the President still appoints the Federal judges, but he appoints the Federal judges in Nebraska and every other State in the Union. So you could not object to that.

But what would be your reaction to doing the same for Hawaii on the assumption that you do not get statehood right away? Would you like to elect your own governor?

Mr. AGUIAR. If we cannot get statehood, we certainly would like to elect the governor. I think we would like to have a way of determining who shall be our judges. Those two go together.

There are no two ways about it. We prefer statehood. We want statehood. We want to send men to this august body of yours. The influence of those men here, their racial tolerance, would be of great benefit to the people in this great body that you have here. They would represent the best products that we have in Hawaii.

I do not think that it would be detrimental to the best interests of this country to send two Senators from Hawaii and a couple of Representatives over here. I think Joe Farrington has been a great boy to mix up with these people in this great country. We have too much smoke here and get worked up.

Every day in Hawaii it is sunshine, and when the rain comes down it wets you good.

Senator BUTLER. Delegate Farrington has the same kind of job I have. I have been here 10 years, and 8 of the 10 I have been in the minority. Delegate Farrington has about the same job. I think he did a better job representing Hawaii in the minority than I have in representing anybody in the minority.

Mr. AGUIAR. It is the Hawaiian climate. In the old days, when the Army sent soldiers to Schofield, nobody could keep up with them for the first 3 months. After that they became like Hawaiians. They are people. They make very good companions over here. I am sure that you agree with us, Senator Butler.

Senator BUTLER. I am a Nebraska farmer, and I feed cattle.

Mr. AGUIAR. I do not have to feed them. I fertilize the grass, and you ought to see them grow.

Senator BUTLER. I would like to see that place.

Mr. AGUIAR. I do not raise steers. When they wean they are within 9 or 10 months; they average over 300 pounds a head. That is how I make money.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Aguiar is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF MANUEL R. AGUIAR, JR., MEMBER, TERRITORIAL SENATE, HAWAII

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: My name is Manuel R. Aguiar, Jr. I was born a Hawaiian citizen, later became a citizen of the Republic of Hawaii, and later again became an American when Hawaii became a Territory of America.

My occupation—I am a farmer and a rancher on a small scale. At the age of 19 I bought a 35-acre homestead through a 4-year purchase plan, and I had to borrow the money to make the first down payment. Today, I am the only independent sugarcane farmer outside of the Big Five in the Territory of Hawaii. I produce an average of 100 tons of sugar a year and have been doing it since the year 1914.

There are many other small sugarcane planters in Hawaii, but they are called "adherent planters." I also produce beef on a small scale. Last year I produced about 24,000 pounds of beef. The average production per acre was about 150 pounds per year.

For the last 5 years I have produced an average of over 130 pounds of beef per year per acre. Previously, I was almost entirely engaged in the production of sugarcane. The farm area is about 180 acres. My wife and my daughters and myself own it in fee simple. When I am not engaged in political activities, I do about half of my work on the farm.

Today I am also a senator in the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (1919 session). I have also served as a member of the Kauai Board of Supervisors for 13 years; 3 years as chairman.

I also served as a public-utilities commissioner for 2 years for the Territory of Hawaii. I have the honor of being elected on the Republican ticket, the non-partisan ticket, and the Democratic ticket. I have been a Democrat since the year 1922.

Today, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to speak as a small farmer and for the small farmers of Hawaii. I have discussed this matter with many small farmers and can safely say that I am their spokesman.

The small farmers of Hawaii are 100 percent for statehood. I don't believe there is one small farmer in Hawaii who is against statehood. We say statehood will give us home rule. We say statehood will place in the hands of the people of Hawaii the power needed to handle the unemployment problem or any other problems that may arise in the State of Hawaii.

We, the small farmers of Hawaii feel that only when our people have the full, free, and total powers of government at our command, only then, can a proper economy be developed to meet the needs of our people. We feel that when the executive and judiciary heads of our government are not the free choice of our people it a half-baked proposition in our government and that, no matter how good

the intent is, it works very unsatisfactorily. This has been the case in Hawaii for many years.

Now, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, how can a Nation like this great United States of America justify a situation in a government like that existing in Hawaii today, where the powers of creating the executive and judiciary departments lie, not in the hands of the people, like the case in Hawaii, but in the hands of the President and the Senate of the United States of America, who know very well personally about the appointees for the departments mentioned? Today the small farmers of Hawaii feel just like the small farmers in this country in the year 1770.

Gentlemen, we have people who are opposed to statehood, and they find it very convenient today to use communism in their defense. The people who use this plan of opposition are being very unfair in their stand. A lot of these people are people who have had things their own way for many years. They are people who do not care a thing about unemployment in the Territory of Hawaii.

They are even too lazy to vote, some of them. They are people of selfish motives. They are not people who care to serve the best interest of the welfare of this country.

Gentlemen, they have their own little private and selfish interest. They will call anyone a Communist. I have heard them call the President of the United States a Communist. They will even call you a Communist if you do not see eye to eye with them. I have been called a Communist dozens of times. Almost every time I meet an opponent of statehood, and we talk about the matter, it ends up: "Ah, you are a Communist."

This word "Communist" is being recklessly used against statehood. It is convenient at present. My opinion, gentlemen, is that there are just about 25 Communists in the Territory of Hawaii, and practically all of them came from the mainland of the United States.

What are you going to do about it? That is a matter for the Congress of the United States to decide. It is a national problem. You should not hold communism against Hawaii as a cause for denying statehood.

As free people, the people of Hawaii, with the full and proper powers in government like those enjoyed by all the 48 States of this great Nation, will be a very valuable asset in the national set-up of this great United States of America.

Now, gentlemen, I am not a very church-going man. I go to church three or four times a year, but I believe with all my heart in the rules of nature. They are the rules of God. To believe the contrary is destructive to the average human.

I want to ask you, especially those of you who are on the fence or against statehood for Hawaii, to examine and check your souls. Are you going to deny the people of Hawaii their God-given right to govern themselves as free men and women under the Stars and Stripes as now enjoyed by the 48 States in the Union?

No, gentlemen; I do not believe you are going to deny the right I have just mentioned to the people of Hawaii. No, gentlemen; you are men with a human heart. You are men of wisdom. You are men of the chosen few mentioned in the Bible.

You are going to give this bill just consideration, and you are going to report it out favorably, I believe. You are going to give the people of Hawaii a square deal.

Thank you, and may God bless you.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I will call Mr. Apaka on behalf of the committee.

STATEMENT OF ALFRED APAKA, MEMBER OF TERRITORIAL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. APAKA. My name is Alfred Apaka. I come from the Island of Molokai, and I occupy a homestead that was created by the Homes Commission Act. I suppose I am the only member of this delegation that came here who cannot boast that I came from any college in the United States.

My father is of Chinese extraction. He was born on the Island of Hawaii in the year 1874.

My grandfather came from China on my Chinese side, one of the earliest settlers, one of the earliest immigrants that came as a laborer for the plantation in the Island of Kauai, the principal plantation.

Ever since I was a child, I had an ambition of one day owning one of those big rice plantations, but I had no chance to own one because the others before me got leases on the land.

At the age of about 18 I migrated to Honolulu and with my limited education in the public schools I found that I could not compete with those of Honolulu who had better education. So I got a job in the iron works at \$9 a week, and I immediately enrolled in the YMCA School, night school.

Out of \$9 a week I paid \$2.50 of that to go to school at night. I took up English and bookkeeping. I went to school for three years at the YMCA. Then after that I got a job with the police department. When this opportunity came to go to Molokai to homestead, that ambition of mine when I was a young child that I wanted to own a piece of land, to homestead, to farm—I am a rice planter, I am not an agriculture farmer but a rice planter—it is all the same as a farmer. So I thought this was an opportunity for me to get ahold of this land and go to homestead.

I applied for it and got this 40 acres of land on the island of Molokai.

Senator Akana said when she first went to the island of Molokai as a public health nurse conditions there were terrible. When I first went there we were still in the 5-year plan.

This plan proposed at the end of 5 years, if it had been proven that the homestead project was not a success, then the project would be eliminated. When I got there it was the last year of the trial year, the people there could not make ends meet. The land was dry land, wonderful soil. The soil is about 14 feet of the same color from the top down. But the only trouble was there is no water to irrigate that. They are dependent on rainfall. The rainfall in that area is only 27 inches. So the farmers have to plan on guessing, and they have guessed from November to March. November is the month in which they planted. But November was not the right month. Then in December the rain came and by that time the corn seeds or whatever seeds were in the ground in November had deteriorated by heat or by bugs. They planted again maybe the following year.

Now their resources have been depleted by continuous guessing on the weather that is so uncertain.

I believe in faith at this particular point, because last year when Secretary Wilson was supposed to come to inspect this project, these farmers had planted watermelons, corn, cucumbers, all different types of vegetables. And for 2 weeks, going on 3 weeks, no rain fell.

I am a Mormon by religion. The people there, most of the homesteaders, I believe, are Mormons. They got together and said, "If there is a God, let's fast and pray for rain."

They did. For 3 days and 3 nights these people fasted. On the last day the rain came for 3 days and 3 nights. And that rain produced the crop. Pumpkins came out, 40 to 50 pounds apiece, and the watermelons came out, 30 to 40 pounds apiece; the corn stalks came up with three to four ears of corn to the stalk. And that was the only year that the corn came out, to this day.

That might not sound possible to some people, but I lived there for over 20 years as a farmer, and it is so.

We were stuck on that land. If I had known beforehand that that was the land that I was going to live on, I would never have gone to it, because I had a pretty good job and a nice home in Honolulu. I sold my home, left my job, to take this land that I had such ambition for when I was a young man.

They said that the Hawaiian Homes Commission had failed in its duties to place the Hawaiians on this land for 30 years. They had in their control and failed to do so. They failed to do so only because, as one of the senators said, of influence. It was never intended that this home commission project should be a success.

I have lived there for over 20 years. I saw all the conditions in the homestead area. I knew that we needed water in the worst way if we wanted to survive.

In 1939 the homesteaders asked me if I would run to become a representative, to represent them in our Territorial legislature, to see if I could get water for them. I did. I ran in 1939 and got elected. And the first bill I introduced when I got to the Territorial legislature was a \$5,000,000 water bill to bring the water to the east end of Molokai to irrigate these 12,000 acres of land. It passed favorably, came to the Congress and passed the House but died in the Senate. There our hopes kind of faded and died with the dying of that bill in the Senate. But the Hawaiians stayed with it, even though they had a hard time. No white man in any State would have homesteaded, would have stood for that. In Nebraska, or some of the States where there are dust bowls the people could not stand it and left the country because they could not make a living. But our people stayed with it for the purpose that this Hawaiian Homes Act should perpetuate, should never die. They stayed there not only to perpetuate the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, but a lot of the people there came from the slums of Honolulu, Tin Can Alley.

When Prince Kuhio introduced this bill in Congress, his first thought was to take the people away from the slums where they were dying so fast. They died because they could not resist the disease brought there by the white man in the slums.

The board of health people could not visit them because they hid and were afraid of them. What they needed was fresh air. When they migrated to Molokai, with a lot of fresh air, even though they did not have adequate food, they were healthy.

Those people raised their children. They are healthy, not like the people I used to know when I was on the police force on Tin Pan Alley, people who were anemic, pale, because they lived in the slums, small rooms.

Now the same people live in a three-room cottage and a big yard, a half-acre yard. Those people are progressive. They are living, and they are healthy.

That is because the certain elements that had no intention that this project should survive have been weeded out one by one. After 1941, when I was elected, they got a good man as secretary of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, and since that time the commission has been really able to put forth what the law was intended for.

When I came on, they had \$1,000,000 to begin with. All that money was spent with nothing to show for what was spent. So it was neces-

sary that in order to put more people on the land, they must have additional money to lend out to the homesteaders who are lucky to draw a lot.

I introduced a bill for \$2,000,000. This \$2,000,000 was in such a way that it would take 10 years out of the old revenue from the Hawaiian Homes Commission lands that are leased to outside interests and 30 percent of that money would go toward building up the revolving fund of \$2,000,000.

This is the last year that they had to build up the \$2,000,000.

We introduced another bill in 1949 for an additional \$2,000,000. So that we could have more money for the revolving fund so that we could put more homesteaders on the land. That bill died in the senate, in our Territorial senate. It was not successful. How could you put a homesteader on land when there is no money to be loaned? They can only be put on land when there are sufficient funds to keep that money revolving, so that as it came back they could keep on lending.

Because I am a homesteader, I may be criticized because I have an interest in this bill as a homesteader. I may be criticizing, and I take the criticism. As far as I am concerned, and the Hawaiian people, it is next to my heart. This Kamuela property we are talking about, all the land in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, that is the best piece of property there is in the 60,000 acres of land.

The land they gave us in Molokai is good land, but barren of water. This land in Molokai that they are talking about, since the water belongs to the Hawaiian Homes Commission land—the Hawaiian Homes Commission, with the present commissioners, with Houston as chairmen, they have 100 lots all cut out, surveyed, ready to be given out for the occupants. These 100 homesteads will take in 150 acres of land. The water will be just sufficient to irrigate this land.

Senator Nobriga's intention was that the land that was leased by the Parker Ranch now has gone back to the Hawaiian Homes Commission, because they wanted that land back. When the land came back, we wanted to divide the land into 14 small parcels; so the plan of the homes commission is, instead of 100 persons there, would 100 persons be better or 14 persons better?

Senator TAYLOR. I can see that you think the Hawaiian Homes Commission is good and should be continued.

Mr. APAKA. It is good and should be perpetuated; it should not be changed at any cost, because it has proven that it has done its job and it is beginning to bear fruit.

Senator TAYLOR. We are happy to have your testimony, you being directly interested. We certainly thank you for appearing.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong the hearings; but before we adjourn, I would like to ask what time the other witnesses expect to occupy so that we may know what to expect tomorrow. Mr. Ezell is leaving, so I would like to give him an opportunity to present his statement.

Senator TAYLOR. We could wind these witnesses up if we met in the morning, could we not?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I wanted to ascertain before we adjourn just what time is going to be required, because if we do, it will be concluded rather promptly, I think.

Senator TAYLOR. If it is 15 minutes, we will go on now.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I want to get in advance just what they promise so they will make good on their promises.

Senator BUTLER. Will it be all right if the chairman keeps time on them, like the chairman does in the Senate?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Ezell, do you want to present your statement to the committee?

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ALLAN EZELL, MEMBER OF TERRITORIAL LEGISLATURE FROM MAUI

Mr. EZELL. I will make mine like a hula skirt: Just long enough to cover the situation and short enough to be interesting. My name is Allan H. Ezell. I am a transplanted Texan, a rock-ribbed Democrat and a member of the House of Representatives in the Hawaiian Legislature. I have lived in Hawaii more than 10 years and am proud, as well as most happy to be counted as one of her citizens. Now, gentlemen, as you well know, the intense pride Texans take in their ancestral State, you must also realize then that when a "Longhorn" finds some rare spot on this earth which he thinks can equal or better Texas, gentlemen, it must be good. Hawaii is that place.

I received my schooling and university work in Texas, including West Point Preparatory School and primary flight training at Randolph Field. I am a disabled Air Force veteran and am district traffic manager on the islands of Maui, Molokai, and Lanai for the safest airline in the United States of America—Hawaiian Airlines.

I feel as strongly as anyone in the Territory that Hawaii is more than ready and qualified to become a State and my feelings are based on careful observations that I, as a Caucasian, have made in comparing the American traditions and ideals with the actual application of such by the people of Hawaii. I live close to the people of Hawaii, that I can assure you, through my church, civic, and social work and activities day in and day out.

To prove my closeness of the people in my county, which is predominantly non-Caucasian, I point out just a bit proudly and yet with all due humility, that when I ran for my first political office in 1948 as a resident of only 2 years in the county, I led the field of 20 candidates, both Republican and Democratic, in the final vote. This is my personal example of the fact that racial or bloc voting is not a real or serious factor in the elections in Hawaii.

In over 3½ years of very active leadership among the Japanese members of the Latter-Day Saints or Mormon Church in Hawaii, and later on all other members of the church, I found them to be sincere and industrious in their every phase of life, and I know what is actually in the hearts of our island folks. And they who think, act, work, and live as Americans want an active voice in the Government that makes Hawaii's over-all policy and guides our destiny.

On December 7, I was in charge of an Army radar installation project on top of a 10,000-foot volcanic peak in Hawaii. The working group of about 80 men were about 60 percent Japanese.

During the hectic nights and days that we worked, through one of the worst sieges of ice, winds, and snow we have known, sometimes running 24-hour shifts in emergencies, not one man fell down on the

job or held back; but to a man they pulled at the traces even harder than could have been requested or expected of them.

And it is singular to note that the oriental boys on the project led all the rest in per capita war-bond sales just as Hawaii itself led the Nation consistently throughout the war. This the boys did even when they did not receive their pay checks for a period of almost 2 months at one time.

Gentlemen, someone before me as a witness stated that the eyes of the Pacific Ocean area are watching Hawaii and the treatment she is receiving in her statehood appeal just as they did our promise of independence to the Philippine Islands. This I know because I traveled around the Pacific Ocean in small craft and lived on many of its islands and with its people for almost 3 years before I came to Hawaii.

They have a great deal of faith in the United States and its word to its people, particularly since the United States kept its word with the Philippine Islands. Is it not worth something to bolster and uphold America's prestige in the Pacific, which she so badly needs now more than ever, by granting our people the right to political maturity and authority in keeping with the financial responsibility she has so ably carried for 50 years. It must be.

For many a Pacific country or group are confused in this changing international scene and are looking to Hawaii for an example of the true application of democratic ideals. And the fulfillment of America's promise to the people of Hawaii will further validate the faith and hopes of Asia in our way of life and help stem the anti-democratic forces hard at work in the Orient. And this is a very effective and yet economic way for the United States to implement a moral force and program where it will be most effective at such a critical time.

You gentlemen may wonder why I, as a loyal Texan and a southerner, am so sold on Hawaii. I will explain it as the closing phase of my testimony.

Without any vain boasting and in all sincerity, I declare to you honorable Senators and helmsmen of our historic ship of state, that Hawaii is approaching the American ideals in her everyday life more directly and more conscientiously than any other part of the United States of America—and I have lived in many parts of the country and so speak from actual experience.

Let me observe that we as Americans usually exercise our privilege of free speech fully and are not at all reluctant to criticize our Government and its shortcomings. And I have had many discussions in the several parts of the country, and in foreign lands as well, as to the relative merits of various ideals and patterns of government. My answer which has never failed to make its point is just this: We as Americans with all our many faults individually and collectively, still actually live and put into practice more of our stated beliefs and ideals—and in so doing produce better results for everyone concerned—than do any other countries in the world despite all the alleged gilt-edged merits of other forms of government and political philosophies. I repeat, we come nearer our ideals and principles in actual daily practice than do any other peoples on earth.

I would like to leave with you my idea of what a true American in the modern-day sense is, and you may see my point about Hawaii's part in developing such people.

It is my understanding that no man, woman, or child, as citizens of the United States, shall be either denied any basic American rights nor any privileges withheld as a result of his or her racial antecedents. And just as practically every person on earth today is a mixture of an endless genealogy of virtually all the bloods of the world, a true American in the modern-day sense would be someone who contained so many polygot bloods in him that not one stood out enough to be obvious, and he therefore could not and would not be singled out for any predominant racial characteristic or attribute. However, we in Hawaii, as well as the United States as a whole, are yet pretty young, ethnologically speaking, and not far enough removed from direct major strains to have reached the ultimate cosmopolitan status yet, as a national group.

But I can give you a perfect personal example of how it is working in Hawaii and how quickly it can and will come to pass in our islands.

My racial antecedents arrived several generations ago from France, Ireland, and Italy—this is to mention only the predominant blood strains in my make-up. My wife carries the ancestral lines of Hawaii, England, Portugal, and Scotland—the major ones that she knows of. Our daughter, then, has seven known strains in her. She will, hopefully, marry some young man some distant day with almost as many or perhaps even more major bloods in his make-up. And their children, gentlemen, will be the prime examples of what true Americans should be: A blending of ancestries from all the world and which fusing of the world's blood lines and characteristics has made and is making America the strongest nation and greatest influence in the world. And Hawaii by this same fact will further help strengthen the United States in this very phase itself.

So I ask you gentlemen: How can the United States reject and turn away the very best salesman for democracy that she now has, and especially at a time when the greatest need of all time exists for the actual living testament of practical and applied democracy?

The world would much rather see in reality than hear in abstract the workings of an idea and its principles. Hawaii is that supersalesman, even under a mountain of handicaps and is a living tribute to the American determination to make an ideal work even under odds. Hawaii, gentlemen, is the gentle reminder to all of the United States of America that our great heritage still stems from the last four letters in the word "American"—"I can."

Thanks, or maholi nui to you gentlemen, for hearing my testimony out. It is my deep-felt hope that you will give sincere study and deliberation both mentally and emotionally before you take final action on H. R. 49 in order that you may do justice to it in all lights.

MR. FARRINGTON. Mr. Kauhane.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES KAUHANE, MEMBER OF TERRITORIAL LEGISLATURE FROM OAHU

MR. KAUHANE. Mr. Chairman, my name is Charles E. Kauhane. I am a member of the Territorial house of representatives and a delegate to the Hawaii Constitutional Convention. I am also a member of the holdover committee of the Territorial legislature in addition to being national committeeman of the Democratic Party from Hawaii.

During the 1947 and 1949 sessions of the legislature, I was honored as the Democratic floor leader.

I was educated in the public schools of Hawaii and I am a graduate of St. Louis College in Honolulu. I am a native Hawaiian and have lived in the Territory for 45 years.

There seems to be much apprehension in Congress concerning statehood for Hawaii because of the large number of citizens of Japanese ancestry. This apprehension seems to be motivated by the thought that this particular category of humanity would vote as a racial bloc, and a result thereof would control political life in the islands if statehood were granted.

In my humble opinion, this is a slander upon the integrity and the true American spirit of our citizens of Japanese ancestry. Their loyalty and patriotism was fully demonstrated by their war record. All fears concerning this particular group of individuals should have been allayed as the result of the testimony of Mr. Seth Richardson, when he stated that he was shocked to find that there was not one instance of sabotage by these people during the entire war. As a native Hawaiian and an American citizen, I am more than willing to entrust the future welfare of my children in the hands of any good American, be he Japanese, Chinese, or any other race.

I believe I am qualified to speak for the people of Hawaii and I say to you that Hawaii should be granted immediate statehood. Now is the time to make this decision, for the people of Hawaii are prepared and are able to shape their own destinies. They ask only the democratic privileges and rights to which they are entitled as free people. They ask no more than that which the United Nations guaranteed unto the peoples of the world—the fullest extension of democracy consistent with the ability to govern.

This Congress has a moral obligation to fulfill to the people of Hawaii. To take a contrary view at the present time would be to repudiate the plebescite in Hawaii on this question, the many memorials to Congress of our legislature, the national support evinced by the press, and the action of the House of Representatives.

Much emphasis has been placed upon the question of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act and the suggestion that it be repealed. Whatever the cause may be concerning the repealing or the deletion of any provision of this act from H. R. 49, it is my feeling that the feeling of the people of my race, the Hawaiians, that no change should be made in the present text of this act. There is nothing unconstitutional involved in setting aside and developing lands of the Territory for native Hawaiians and there has been congressional precedence for legislating along this line. Our Indians, soldiers, and sailors have been granted special benefits.

The Hawaiian race is passing and if conditions continue to exist as they do today, the splendid race of people, my people, will pass from the face of the earth. I feel, therefore, a heavy responsibility in this matter. It is one wherein I ask you gentlemen to share with me the thought that the provisions of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act should be retained, for the purposes for which it was set up—the rehabilitation of the Hawaiian race.

In conclusion, may I again urge, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, that Hawaii be granted immediate statehood.

Thank you and aloha.

I would like to submit an editorial with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act that was published in the local papers in Honolulu. This will be evidence against arguments ranging as to why the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act should not be continued.

Senator TAYLOR. This will be made a part of the record.

(The editorial is as follows:)

HAWAIIAN HOMES ACT CORRECTED AN INJUSTICE

(NOTE.—Territorial Senator W. J. Nobriga is trying to smash the Hawaiian Homes Commission. He asserts that setting apart lands for use by Hawaiians is unconstitutional because it is "discriminatory." He has gone to Washington for the Hawaii statehood hearings which opened today. He hopes to get an expression of opinion there that will knock the Hawaiian Homes Act provision out of the State constitution for Hawaii now being drafted. This is one of a series of editorials dealing with the present provision in Hawaii's organic act, and with the need for retaining its principles in the new constitution.)

The Hawaiian Homes Act of Congress is under fire. In the constitutional convention an attempt is being made by Delegate Marguerite K. Ashford, of Molokai, to read it out of the law when Hawaii's State constitution is adopted.

And Senator William J. Nobriga of the big island is waging a fight of his own to destroy the Hawaiian homes project. Neither has been given much support here. So Senator Nobriga has gone to Washington.

In order to understand the basis for the Hawaiian Homes Act, it is necessary to know the arguments that were presented to Congress in 1920 and 1921 in support of it.

There was strong sentiment for the Hawaiians in those arguments. But there was also strong practical sense.

These arguments, when made by Delegate Prince Kuhio Kalanianaʻole with the support of the Territorial legislature and the legal endorsement of the Territorial attorney general, stemmed in part from an injustice of the great mabele (land partition) of 1847.

At that time the lands were to be divided in substantially equal amounts among the crown, the nobles, and the commoners, with one-third of each share retained by the government as public lands.

The people's share was the smallest of the three, roughly 900,000 acres. And because of "jokers" in the regulations specifying the manner in which title was to be secured only about 28,000 acres ever found their way into the legal possession of the commoners. The rest reverted to the government, and passed on to the Republic of Hawaii as government lands.

When Hawaii was annexed, these same lands became a part of the United States domain. Congress deputized the Territorial government to act as the agent of the Federal Government in administering these lands, and granted the Territory the use of revenues from rents.

It was, then, on the moral issue, buttressed by logic, that at least a portion of these public lands were properly the birthright of individual Hawaiians that the case for the Hawaiian Homes Act was made.

In some respects—but by no means all respects—there was a parallel between the Hawaiian Homes Act and legislation providing for reservations set apart for the Indian tribes of the mainland.

It was a recognition of the moral right of the first settlers to possession of lands for their homes, farms, pastures.

The other major argument offered at the time (1920) was that the Hawaiian race was dying out because it was having difficulty adjusting itself to the fast pace of the white man's civilization, and that securing a portion of the land for the Hawaiians would be the means of rehabilitating the race.

Congress accepted these arguments and enacted the Hawaiian Homes Act. This set aside a portion of the Federal lands in Hawaii for the exclusive use of the Hawaiian people for home sites and farms. Provisions were made for a revolving fund to provide loans for constructing buildings. Land rent was nominal, and the 99-year leases were nontransferable.

Amendments have been made to the Hawaiian Homes Act from time to time. But the basic premises upon which the law was enacted have never been altered. And the language of the act makes it plain that it was the intention of Congress that these lands were to be preserved in perpetuity for the Hawaiian people.

This is evident in the legitimate and common sense device of incorporating the Hawaiian Homes Act in the organic act of the Territory. Here is plain proof of intent to insure the permanence of the legislation.

It is therefore likely that, in the present situation, Congress, sensitive to this expressed intent, will not be inclined to precipitous action to take these lands away from the Hawaiian people who now occupy them, or the Hawaiian people who, in the future, may make claim to them.

The language of the Federal act also is a warning to the people of Hawaii to proceed slowly and with utmost consideration in any attempt to set aside legislation whose permanency has had a continuing stamp of congressional approval for three decades.

(Future editorials will discuss some of the present-day phases of this controversy.)

Senator BUTLER. Mr. Kauhane, you are the Democratic committeeman?

Mr. KAUHANE. Yes; I am sir.

Senator BUTLER. Mrs. Victoria Holt is the committeewoman?

Mr. KAUHANE. That is right.

Senator BUTLER. I am quite interested, because I served my term as Republican committeeman from Nebraska, and I appreciate it is a very important assignment. I wish we had a lot more time because we could have gotten a lot of information from you, without question. But I will not take the time now.

Mr. KAUHANE. I will be glad to meet with you any time you wish.

Senator BUTLER. You can drop by the office.

Mr. FARRINGTON. He will be here tomorrow if you want to open up that subject, sir.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Representative Walter McGuire.

STATEMENT OF WALTER MCGUIRE, MEMBER OF TERRITORIAL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM OAHU

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, my name is Walter McGuire. I have nothing further to submit for the record. I have my brief here, which I would like to submit for the record.

Senator TAYLOR. Very well. It will be included as a part of the record.

(The statement of Walter McGuire is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF WALTER MCGUIRE, MEMBER OF TERRITORIAL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FROM OAHU

Mr. Chairman, my name is Walter McGuire. I am a native of Hawaii, being of Irish-Chinese-Hawaiian ancestry. My father, who was of Irish descent, came to the islands on a whaling schooner and worked until his retirement at the Oahu Railway & Land Co. My mother is of Chinese-Hawaiian ancestry and was educated in the schools of Hawaii, having taught in the public schools of the Territory for a period of 38 years.

I received my early education in Kamehameha School for Boys and Punahou Academy, the latter school being the first English-speaking school west of the Rocky Mountains, being founded in the year 1841.

I am a graduate of the University of Wisconsin and have been a continuous resident of Hawaii ever since. Upon graduation from college, I was affiliated for a short period with the Mutual Telephone Co. in Honolulu. I then transferred my affections to the Honolulu Rapid Transit Co., where I served as assistant to the president for a period of 13 years. I am now in business for myself operating an automobile repair shop.

I have been a member of the Territorial house of representatives from the Fourth District for a period of 6 years. It might be noteworthy to mention that the Fourth Representative District is the largest in Hawaii with a majority of its voters being of the Caucasian race.

It would be presumptuous of me to ask you gentlemen to listen to repetitious statements on my part concerning the arguments for statehood since the same have been very ably expressed by previous witnesses. I shall, therefore, confine my plea to the simple statement that it is my humble opinion that the people of Hawaii are ready for statehood. We therefore request your consideration in reporting this bill out as soon as possible so that the Senate as a whole can give us our answer once and for all as to how we stand on this question.

As to the provisions of the present bill, previous speakers have given you our thinking on what changes should be made at this time. As a Part-Hawaiian, I seek your assistance in thwarting any attempt by certain mercenary individuals who will ask you to make changes in the bill's provisions relating to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

Personally, I have no ax to grind as it relates to this particular question for I do not qualify under the provisions of this act. However, I am sure you will agree that the only way that we can preserve unto Hawaii its nativity is by the continuance of this rehabilitation program.

I ask the question: Are we asking too much when we know that out of the 4,000,000 acres in Hawaii a mere 180,000 acres were set aside for this program? It should be brought to your attention that of the entire amount set aside, not all is arable, land, since much of it is in the form of rocky mountainside and is of no particular use to anyone.

The question has been raised as to why we have not settled on this land, since the enactment of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. The answer is very simple. The Hawaiian race is made up of poor people. They have not had the necessary money to open these lands without assistance from the government.

When the project was first started, a mere \$1,000,000 was made available to these people. Today that sum has been increased to \$2,000,000 and is in the form of a revolving fund subject to being loaned to these people for minimum rates of interest to assist them in their rehabilitation.

If the selfish objections to this particular provision in law would take the time and effort to review the results of our past legislative sessions, they will be brought to the realization that the Hawaiians are not the only group receiving assistance from our government.

In conclusion, I do, therefore, join with the vast majority of the people of Hawaii who are asking your consideration for immediate statehood for our Territory.

Mr. McGUIRE. Thank you very kindly.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would like to say that Mr. McGuire in his day was one of Wisconsin's great football players.

Senator TAYLOR. He looks like he would be capable.

Mr. FARRINGTON. The next witness is Mr. Miyake of the island of Kauai, a veteran of World War I, a small-business man.

STATEMENT OF NOBURU MIYAKE, MEMBER OF TERRITORIAL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM KAUAI

Mr. MIYAKE. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I have a very short statement which I would like to read. My name is Noburu Miyake. I am an American citizen of Japanese ancestry. I am a member of the Territorial legislature and a member of the Subcommittee on Statehood, Un-American Activities, Public Lands, and Government Efficiency of the Legislature Holdover Committee of 1949.

My parents, like many others, were immigrants who came to Hawaii from Japan early in the nineteenth century as a contract laborer to work in the sugar plantations of Hawaii and remained in the Terri-

tory to make their permanent home. They were blessed with eight children and three of their sons served in the United States Army during World War I and one in World War II.

I am an independent businessman and a veteran of World War I. During World War II, I served as an officer in the Office of Civilian Defense and the Office of Price Administration to coordinate the activities of the civilian population in an all-out effort to win the war.

My political career goes back to as early as 1929 when I first ran for public office as a member of the Kauai County Board of Supervisors. During this early period they were only a small number of voters of citizens of Japanese, Chinese, or Caucasian ancestry. The majority of the voters were of the Hawaiian race. In spite of these situations I was elected outright in the primary election and became the first American of Japanese ancestry to be elected to a public office in the Territory of Hawaii.

I have served five terms as a member of the board of supervisors of the county of Kauai and one term in the Territorial legislature.

During the last 20 years I have been closely associated with the social, economic, and political affairs of the Territory of Hawaii, and I feel very strongly that the people of Hawaii have proved themselves beyond a doubt as to their loyalty to the United States of America in peace and in war and their ability to govern themselves beyond questioning.

The history of Hawaii and its aspiration for statehood is nothing more than the history in the United States. It is only natural for the citizens of Hawaii to ask for statehood. It only proves that the people of Hawaii are progressive and true in spirit to the democratic process of our government.

I sincerely believe that Hawaii has met all its obligations to become a State. Our population exceeds that of several States. We now pay more Federal taxes than 10 States. Our economic system is sound. Our educational system in Hawaii is equal or better than that of many States. We have a progressive government with liberal labor laws and adequate protection for the health and welfare of the people. All these are conclusive evidence that we are qualified to become a State.

Opponent of statehood has raised the question that Hawaii should not become a State because of communism. Communism is not a problem unique in Hawaii. It is a problem throughout the world and can be effectively controlled by proper legislation under conditions where it exists.

In conclusion, I would like to say that statehood for Hawaii will strengthen our position in the Pacific and protect our people, to improve our social and economic conditions in Hawaii as well as in the United States.

I thank you. I ask the gentlemen to pass House Resolution 49 so Hawaii will become the forty-ninth State of the United States.

Senator TAYLOR. Thank you.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Sakakihara. Mr. Sakakihara is a representative from the island of Hawaii.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS T. SAKAKIHARA, MEMBER OF TERRITORIAL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM HAWAII

Mr. SAKAKIHARA. My name is Thomas T. Sakakihara, representative in the Territorial house of representatives from the first district, island of Hawaii. I was born in Hilo, Hawaii. I have been a member of the legislature for the past 10 sessions, and have consistently been a proponent of statehood.

At present I am a member of the Hawaii State Constitution Convention, and hold the office of vice president. I was admitted to practice law in the district courts of Hawaii in 1921, and have practiced therein to date.

In 1935, 1937, 1946, and 1948 I appeared before the Subcommittee on Statehood for Hawaii of the United States House of Representatives, the joint committee of the Senate and House, and the United States Senate.

Hawaii should be granted statehood. Hawaii is able to contribute to the national welfare as a state, and as a Territorial elected official, I speak on behalf of the people of the Territory in support of statehood. Hawaii has the capacity and the resources for statehood. The best evidence of good citizenship in Hawaii is the excellent educational system it possesses. The contributions of the people of the Territory to the National Treasury far exceed that of numerous States.

The executive, legislative and judicial branches are models of exemplary government. Many laws enacted by the legislatures of Hawaii indicate that Hawaii, if admitted as a State, can better serve the Nation than as a Territory.

The citizens of the Territory of Hawaii deserve the right to enjoy full American citizenship, to participate in the national elections by voting for the President and Vice President of the United States, and to have representation in the United States Congress by electing two Senators and Representatives.

Senator TAYLOR. Thank you, sir.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Itagaki. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, at this point that Mr. Itagaki is one of the veterans of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regiment and was to have appeared at the time the veterans appeared. Through some misunderstanding on the part of those who arranged the witnesses, he was not called at that time.

I am very sorry for that, but I do want you to know that he is among the men in our legislature who served with great distinction in the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team. He is also a member of the house of representatives from the fifth district of the island of Oahu.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH ITAGAKI, MEMBER OF TERRITORIAL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM OAHU

Mr. ITAGAKI. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, Mr. Delegate Farrington has given you a very good introduction of myself. So it seems that an introduction of myself is not necessary.

I would like to say for the record that my name is Joseph R. Itagaki, member of the Territorial legislature from the fifth district. Incidentally, the fifth district embraces Pearl Harbor and Schofield Barracks. I am sorry that Senator Cordon is not here, because Senator Cordon came up to our restaurant to have lunch as a member of the Rotary Club. He would have some idea as to the closeness of my home to Schofield Barracks. I want to get back later on in my talk regarding the bombing and the strafing of Schofield Barracks. I was an eyewitness of that attack on December 7, 1941.

I want to say that I am a veteran of World War II. I have served in four major campaigns. I was 36 years old when I volunteered into the service. I am a recipient of the Bronze Star and am a disabled veteran.

I also would like at this time to add that my son, who is now a student at the University of Hawaii, is also a veteran of World War II.

On the morning of December 7, I was getting ready to go out and play a game of golf. The game of golf reminds me very much of the statehood issue, as to my experience in trying to become a member of the Schofield Officers' Golf Club. Ten years prior to 1941 I applied to become a member of the Schofield Golf Club, but I was never admitted. The only privilege that I received was to go out and practice on the driving range, and I practiced on the driving range. Within 10 years I have learned to hit the ball straight.

Now, I think that the Territory of Hawaii has been practicing for statehood for the past 50 years, and they have in 50 years learned to hit the ball straight and hard, and I think they are ready for statehood now.

If the conclusion is as good as mine—after the war I was accepted as a full-fledged member of this golf club, and I hope that you will see your way so that the Territory of Hawaii may be accepted as one of the States of the Union.

On December 7, immediately after the attack, I volunteered my services to the FBI, thinking that if there were any espionage or any kind of foul play by the Japanese-Americans, I would be able to detect it better than any other nationality. But at that time they were very well organized and they did not need my services.

So I immediately volunteered my services and went into the Hawaiian Territorial Guard. Our job was to guard all installations, roads, trails, bridges, and so forth; and we served as members of the Hawaiian Territorial Guard for 3 months.

February of the following year orders came from Washington that no Japanese-American was permitted to serve or to wear the American uniform. So we were honorably discharged and sent back to our respective jobs. We did not take that seriously because we felt that as Americans, it was our duty to do whatever we could.

So many of us wrote letters to the President, to the Secretary of State, and other influential people in Washington. Consequently, or perhaps through the aid of other influential people, the answer came to us in February of 1943, when they decided to form the Japanese-American combat team.

The original quota in setting up this combat team was 1,500 Japanese-Americans from Honolulu or the Territory of Hawaii, and

3,000 from the continental United States. But I want to say this, gentlemen, that the response in Hawaii was so great that in less than 2 weeks there were over 10,000 volunteers for combat duty. So the War Department reversed the quota and gave Hawaii the quota of 3,000 and the continental United States, 1,500.

I want to say that I was one of the 2,800 that came to the mainland and trained in Mississippi like you have heard the previous veterans testify here.

I would like to say at this time also that the slant of a man's heart and not his eyes is the staff of Americanism. I think Gen. Mark Clark ably put it when he made a statement to the effect, "The supreme test of citizenship is the willingness of a man to risk his life so that our country may live."

I also would like to quote another paragraph by another famous general, and he is known as Gen. "Vinegar Joe" Stilwell: "These Japanese-American troops bought an awful hunk of America with their blood."

Now we have demonstrated in every possible way that we are as good Americans as anybody else. Yet there are a few skeptics even in Hawaii today that use race as an issue. There are other issues that are involved in the hindrance of statehood at the present time, and one of them is that we are not contiguous.

I am not trying to start a debate here, but I feel that we are contiguous, because the ocean bottoms connect. The only difference is we have a wide span of water between us, and I think that is a definite asset to the United States because we can be a first line of defense, as we have proven in the last war.

I do not like to go on further because there are others who would like to speak. In closing, I would like to make one more remark, and that is, right here in Washington, when the Four Hundred and Forty-second returned to the mainland in a body, the regiment was reviewed by the President of the United States, and he made this comment: "You men of the Four Hundred and Forty-second fought not only the enemy abroad, but prejudice at home, and you won."

Now I feel that we have not won until we have secured statehood for the Territory of Hawaii. You members of this committee and Senators of the United States can help us win this fight against prejudice by enacting pending legislation that will prove that Americanism is a matter of the mind and heart and not of race.

Mr. Chairman, I was asked the Veterans Club of the Four Hundred and Forty-second, the One Hundredth Veterans Club, the Military Intelligence Club, and the One Thousand Three Hundred and Thirty-ninth Engineers to present this resolution, and it is a unanimous consent of all of these veterans' clubs that they are for statehood.

Now, I would like to leave this in your care. I think they are all in different envelopes of the various committee members. I thank you very much for your patience, and I hope that you give us fair consideration. Thank you very much.

Senator TAYLOR. Thank you.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, each one of these witnesses can extend his remarks in the record?

Senator TAYLOR. Yes, that will be done.

(The statement of Mr. Itagaki is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH ITAGAKI, MEMBER OF TERRITORIAL HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES FROM OAHU

Mr. Chairman, my name is Joseph R. Itagaki. I am a member of the Territorial legislature from the fifth district. This district, incidentally, includes Pearl Harbor. I have managed Kemoo Farms Restaurant, just outside Schofield Barracks, for 27 years.

Even as a little boy I wanted statehood for Hawaii, because I realized that without statehood we were not truly accepted by other Americans as worthy of the responsibilities of the franchise of self-government. For many years we have heard many reasons advanced for this denial of status, but the one that strikes home hardest to me is that of race—that because there are so many persons of Japanese ancestry in Hawaii the loyalty of the islands themselves are suspect and questioned.

Because I was among those who, through no fault of my own, am of Japanese ancestry, this problem troubled me greatly. How could we prove beyond all doubt that we were as American as any Yankee?

We paid and continue to pay our taxes. We obeyed and continue to obey the laws. In fact, police department records will show that persons of Japanese ancestry have a lower crime rate than any other group in the islands. We went and still go to the schools. We own our own homes; operate our own businesses; we contribute to the community welfare. We did and continue to do just about everything that was and is considered good citizenship. Yet in spite of all this there were still those few who raised a question about our basic loyalty.

How could we demonstrate our love of country in any other way than those in which we were trying to show our Americanism? It was not until that fateful morning, December 7, 1941, that I, and thousands of my fellow Americans of Japanese ancestry, found that answer.

Like millions of other Americans in all parts of the United States, I had made plans to play a round or two of Sunday golf that morning on the Army course. About 7 o'clock, as I was preparing to leave my home, I heard explosion after explosion and the ground actually moved as in a great earthquake. I rushed outside, not knowing what to expect.

Then I saw planes—it looked like millions of them to me as I recall the scene—charging across the sky with flaming guns and exploding bombs. Some of them flew so low that I saw the Rising Sun of Japan blazoned on their wings. Of course, that sun is not rising any more.

But I could not believe what I saw—my America, my Hawaii, my own threshold actually being fired upon by an enemy—and that enemy was Japan. Later, when the awful truth shocked my consciousness I felt as angry—no, darn right mad—as any American anywhere in the world. I didn't consider myself kin to these enemy pilots who were attempting to destroy everything that I knew and held dear. Words cannot describe it, but I forgot race and ancestry; I forgot everything except that my America was being attacked by an enemy. And I wanted to do something about it.

Early the next morning, I rushed down and volunteered for the Hawaiian Territorial Guard. For the next 3 months, I helped guard the utilities, power plants, bridges, and trails, and prepared to repel possible paratroop action by the Japanese enemy.

In February 1942, much to my disgust and that of my comrades, the Army in Washington decided that no person with any Japanese blood could wear the uniform of the United States. So, we were all given honorable discharges and mustered out of the service. Most of us did not like it. We felt that, as Americans, we had a score to settle with those who had dared attack us.

So, thousands of us wrote letters to the President, to the Secretary of War, to Selective Service, to others requesting—no, demanding—the right to serve our country in her hour of greatest need—to fight and if necessary to die to keep secure the American heritage. Our efforts finally paid off.

A year later, on February 1, 1943, the War Department announced the formation of a combat team composed entirely of American citizens of Japanese ancestry. Everyone had to be a volunteer, not for soft jobs in the Army but for combat. This was a real challenge, but we were thrilled because President Roosevelt, in approving this action, defined our status in the following words:

"The principle on which this country was founded and by which it has always been governed in that Americanism is a matter of the mind and the heart; Americanism is not, and never was, a matter of race or ancestry."

The original call for Hawaii was for 1,500 volunteers. In less than 2 weeks, more than 10,000 responded to our country's call to battle. I was the first to volunteer from my district. At that time I was 36 years of age, married, and with a son 15 years of age.

With so many young men the Army did not need or want old men like me, but I personally went to Army headquarters and insisted that I be allowed to serve. The record will show that I was the first volunteer to be inducted from the Island of Oahu, the most populous island. I am proud of this fact because along with 2,800 other Americans of Japanese ancestry from Hawaii we made up what later became the famous Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team.

Perhaps you may wonder why we did not volunteer to fight the Japanese enemy. Actually, when we volunteered, we did not know which theater we would be sent to. Most of us, I am confident, would have preferred to fight the Japanese enemy that had attacked our homes, but the Army decided to send us to Europe in order to prevent us from being confused by other American troops for the Pacific foe.

As a matter of record, many were later selected to serve in the Pacific, in intelligence, where they served with great distinction.

The exploits of the Four Hundred and Forty-second are a part of military legend. We have often been cited as the most-decorated military unit for our size and length of service in American history. As a disabled veteran who was awarded the Bronze Star Medal and a cluster, I served through four campaigns—Rome-Arno, North Appenines, Po Valley, and Rhineland—and saw some of the bitterest fighting in the European theater.

Our rescue of the lost Texas battalion of white Americans in the Vosges Mountains of northeastern France won for the Four hundred and Forty-second one of its seven Presidential distinguished-unit citations, more than any other outfit in World War II received. I believe that I can say from my own experience that we Americans of Japanese ancestry fought as we did because we wanted not only our America to win the war but to prove to all skeptics that the slant of a man's heart, not his eye, is the test of Americanism.

After I was discharged, my son Jay, volunteered for military service and saw more than 18 months of occupation duty in Japan. Gen. Mark W. Clark, our commanding general in Italy, declared in presenting a Presidential citation to us:

"The supreme test of citizenship is the willingness of a man to risk his life so that our country may live."

Ask General Clark how we measured up to that yardstick. Ask the boys of the Thirty-fourth, the Thirty-sixth, and every other outfit that we fought with. Ask the more than 600 of our Japanese-American soldier dead who not only risked but gave their lives that our country might live.

To those who still say that we persons of Japanese ancestry are suspect, I can only repeat—look at the record. As the late, beloved Gen. "Vinegar Joe" Stilwell declared, in awarding a Distinguished Service Cross posthumously to one of my comrades: "These Japanese-American troops bought an awful hunk of America with their blood."

We Americans of Japanese ancestry, we veterans of the wars in both the Pacific and Europe, come to you today to request in the name of our fallen comrades that statehood be extended to their home and our home—Hawaii. Then and only then will President Truman's word to us in July 1946, following a Presidential parade right here in Washington, become a living reality.

On that day the President said:

"You men of the Four Hundred and Forty-second fought not only the enemy abroad but prejudice at home—and you won." Until we have secured statehood for the Territory of Hawaii, we shall not have won over prejudice.

And members of this committee and the Senate of the United States can help us win this fight against the common foe of democracy—prejudice—by enacting pending legislation that will prove that Americanism is a matter of the mind and the heart, and not of race or ancestry.

At the request of the presidents of the Four Hundred and Forty-Second Veterans Club, the One-Hundredth Veterans Club, the Military Intelligence Club, and the 1339 Engineers, I wish to have placed in the record their unanimous joint resolution urging statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would like to call next Akoni Pule from the island of Hawaii.

**STATEMENT OF AKONI PULE, MEMBER OF TERRITORIAL HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM HAWAII**

Mr. PULE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have a written statement.

Senator TAYLOR. Very well, you may proceed.

Mr. PULE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Akoni Pule. I am a Hawaiian and have lived in the Territory for 44 years. I was educated in the public schools in the Territory. My home is at Kohala, county of Hawaii. I was elected a representative from the second representative district, county of Hawaii and I have served as a representative for two legislative sessions in 1947 and 1949. I am now a member of the 1949 Territorial legislative hold-over committee.

I express the sentiment of the people of the Territory when I say to you gentlemen, Hawaii is ready and qualified to become a State.

Being of Hawaiian ancestry, I wish to add that I am speaking for and in behalf of my people, the Hawaiians, that the Hawaiian Homes Act as provided for in H. R. 49 should remain as is.

In conclusion, may I also say that the people of the Territory of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question, not only their loyalty and patriotism, but also their desire to assume the responsibility of statehood.

Thank you, sir.

Senator TAYLOR. Thank you.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Steere Noda of the island of Oahu, a veteran of World War I, I believe.

**STATEMENT OF STEERE NODA, MEMBER OF TERRITORIAL HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM OAHU**

Mr. NODA. Mr. Chairman, I have a statement here which I will present.

Senator TAYLOR. Very well, you may proceed.

Mr. NODA. Mr. Chairman, my name is Steere G. Noda, member of the Territorial legislature from Hawaii and at the present time serving as a member of the holdover committee of 1949.

I am also a delegate to the constitutional convention which now is holding forth in Honolulu. I have been a public servant for over 20 years, serving both the Territorial and Federal Governments. I am a veteran of World War I and at the present time I am practicing law as a district court practitioner, and have been doing so for the past 25 years.

My father and mother came to Hawaii from Japan in 1891 and I was born shortly thereafter. I received my education in the public schools of Hawaii. I am married and have four children, two boys and two girls. My first son is a graduate of the University of Michigan and my second son a graduate of the University of Hawaii and St. Louis University of Missouri.

My second daughter is also a graduate of the University of Hawaii. As a father, I believe I have carried forth the true American tradition by having consummated my duty in giving my children a sound democratic education.

Mr. King has mentioned that he has six grandchildren and I am proud to say that I am not far behind him by informing you that I have five grandchildren. I am proud to mention that one of my grandchildren is a hapa-haole, which means, in Hawaiian, half-Caucasian, and I am very proud of that fact.

Years ago your forefathers fought and won a war which freed them from the tyranny of taxation without representation. Yet here we still have 400,000 American citizens who are taxed by the American Government with no control over their future destinies.

We in Hawaii have paid into the Federal Government more than a billion dollars in the 50 years since our annexation. Hawaii has been consistently among the eight highest purchasers of American goods, and its exports, mostly to the United States, exceed \$2,000,000,000 annually.

Today, Hawaii's tax bill is greater than that of 10 States; yet we are deprived of the privilege of casting a vote for the President or having a Governor of our own choosing. Our Delegate to Congress has no vote and we are without representation in the Senate.

I constantly ask myself these questions: Why not? Why the discrimination? Why isn't Hawaii a State? As members of this committee, you are familiar with the more common reasons given for opposing statehood, to wit:

Firstly, the islands are not contiguous to the continental mainland.

Secondly, the natives are politically immature.

Thirdly, that statehood would give political equality to an island whose large non-Caucasian population which might block vote and thus gain control of the new State.

Fourthly, that Hawaii's admission to the Union would increase the disproportionate voting power of small States in the Senate.

Fifthly, that the islands are a hotbed of communism.

Let us take up these objections in order. First there is a question of noncontiguity. Hawaii is as close to San Francisco as San Francisco is to Washington. It is 9 hours from Hawaii to the mainland by air. Therefore, I ask the question: Is this a valid reason for denying us the privilege of statehood?

Some Members of Congress would impose upon Hawaii a period of political adolescence which seems to us as being unreasonably long. Hawaiians have been Americans since the beginning of the century and the record shows that of the 29 former Territories, only one, New Mexico, had a wait longer than Hawaii for statehood. I therefore ask the question: Is 50 years' apprenticeship not long enough to serve before receiving our majority?

The Hawaiian Government, with its officials popularly elected and completely supported, is conceded by all to be as consistently efficient as any on the mainland.

The objection of Hawaii's non-Caucasian races violates the fundamental principles of democracy. The fear that they might seize political control for some harmful purpose shows a sad lack of faith in the freedom and opportunity which makes a democracy so blessedly attractive. Under it, Hawaii's yellow- and brown-skinned citizens even now enjoy an equality that might serve as a pattern for the American mainland.

As for the voting strength which the Senate set-up gives to the smaller States who have a situation which has existed since we secured

our American freedom and if the populous States want to make any change as it relates to this situation, then it must be through constitutional amendment and it is the problem of the American people and should not in any way be used as an argument for denying statehood to Hawaii.

Since Representative Francis Walter has informed you concerning the communistic activities in Hawaii, I do not feel that it is necessary for me to elaborate upon the same.

We stand on the threshold of the Orient and serve as the political front line of American democracy. Our citizens today enjoy many advantages that are a part of their American citizenship and if our Government will grant us the full equal rights which are inherent to our citizenship, it will correct an injustice and be a headline to the eastern worlds that the American Government practices what it preaches.

Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, I want to thank you for the consideration you have given me in giving me this opportunity of making this statement before your committee. It was indeed a great honor and privilege and something which I never dreamed of. And I want to say to each and every one of you that I appreciate this opportunity from the bottom of my heart.

Senator TAYLOR. Thank you, sir. We are honored to have you appear before us.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would like to call Mrs. Esther Richardson, a representative from the Island of Hawaii. Mrs. Richardson.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ESTHER RICHARDSON, MEMBER OF TERRITORIAL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM HAWAII

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am sorry I have not any written statement to present to you today, although I had one when I came from home. But like most women, at the hearing of the other witnesses, I thought I would prepare one while sitting in the back of the room.

My name is Esther Richardson. I was born and raised on the island of Oahu, was educated in our public and private schools of the Territory of Hawaii. I am of Hawaiian-Chinese-Caucasian parentage, married to a First World War veteran, a housewife, mother of two veterans of World War II.

My oldest son was a Yale graduate, served as a major in the Medical Corps of the United States Army during World War II. At present he is a resident doctor at the University of Pennsylvania Hospital in Philadelphia. My second son was drafted into the Army soon after graduation in 1945, was sent to Germany as a paratrooper, has now chosen the Army as his career, and is at present stationed at Fort Dix, N. J., a personnel sergeant major for the station hospital.

I now reside in Kealahou on the west side of the Island of Hawaii, or known as West Hawaii. I ran for public office from that district and was elected as a representative from the second representative district of the Territory as a member of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii, in 1942.

I am now serving my fourth term as a legislator. I am a member of the Hold-Over Committee of 1949, and a member of the subcommittee of the Hold-Over Committee, namely, education, civil service,

government efficiency, and chairman of the harbor and airport committee, and a member of the Young Women's Christian Association, and a society which is composed of all women that are born of Hawaiian blood, the Daughters of Hawaii. To be eligible to be a member of that association, you have to be born on the islands, or your parents born on the islands. Outdoor Circle, the Hawaiian Girls' Club, YWCA, and the Christian Church Guild in Kealakekua.

I have told you of my background; and as a housewife and mother, and member of these various associations, and a public servant, I come before you asking you for statehood for my people in Hawaii.

The people of the Territory have demonstrated beyond question their loyalty and patriotism to the United States Government, and now desire to assume the responsibility of statehood. Statehood is essential to the progress of the Territory. We who were born and raised on the islands have lived in hopes that some day we will be admitted into the Union, and that day is here.

Hawaii has met the necessary requirements of statehood and is fully prepared for statehood. We want to have the full privileges of American citizens. The racial groups in Hawaii live together and work together harmoniously. I need not tell you any more about my people, because the previous witnesses have already told you all about Hawaii. But there are two question in the minds of the people of Hawaii.

Question No. 1, and I have it marked here that way: Why is Hawaii not admitted into the Union? Question No. 2: What more should we do to be a State?

I have answered these questions in my own way. Have courage, patience. So you can see, gentlemen of the committee, by a delegation as large as this group from Hawaii how hopeful and anxious we are to become a State.

I want to thank you in a real Hawaiian fashion for giving me this time in your presence. Aloha from Hawaii, which means love from Hawaii. I also want it to be in the record that I am very much in favor of the Hawaiian Homes Commission for the Hawaiians, because had it not been for the Hawaiians being so kind to all those who have gone to the islands to adopt the Hawaiian ways of living, the Hawaiians have extended to them the hospitality and have added to the progress of our islands. Thank you.

Senator TAYLOR. Thank you.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I think Mr. Frank Y. Kam has a statement he will file. He is a former member of the legislature and a member of the constitutional convention.

STATEMENT OF FRANK Y. KAM, MEMBER, STATE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. KAM. Honorable Senators, I have a prepared statement which, with your permission, I would like to read, and submit for the record.

Senator TAYLOR. Very well.

Mr. KAM. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Frank Y. Kam. I am speaking as a businessman from Honolulu, Oahu. I am a United States citizen by birth and of Chinese ancestry. I am 36 years of age, born in Honolulu on June 11, 1914, and educated in the local schools, graduated from Kalihi-Kai

Grammar School, Kalakua Intermediate School and St. Louis College.

My wife, the former Miss Mildred Seto, of Chinese ancestry, was born on Kauai, T. H., and is a graduate of Eleele Grammar School, University of Hawaii and the Philadelphia School of Occupational Therapy. She also attended the University of Wisconsin, doing work in speech. We have a son, Frank, 1 year and 3 months old.

My father, the late Mr. Kim Tai Kam, was born in Honolulu, Oahu, the child of early settlers. He started as a laborer in the rice fields and in 1910 became the founder of the Kim Tai Kam Food Store located in Kalihi.

Upon my graduation from St. Louis College in 1934, I worked for my father as manager of his grocery store. He died in 1937. In 1939 I became the sole owner of the modest grocery store now known as Frankie's Market. My mother died in 1949.

As one of many small-business men of Kalihi, a neighborhood of Honolulu having a truly interracial population of approximately 10,000 people, I became keenly aware of the little man's problems and hence I became active in civic affairs.

Among the civic organizations to which I belong are the following: Kalihi Branch of the YMCA, Kalihi-Paloma Community Council, St. Louis Alumni Association, Kamehameha Lions Club, Honolulu Boy Scouts, Hawaii-Chinese Civic Club, American-Chinese Club, Kam Society and the Kalihi Health Club. I am president of the Kalihi Golf Club and was the first president of the Kalihi Business Association.

I maintain a membership in several of the chambers of commerce—the Honolulu, Chinese, and Junior Chamber—as well as the Better Business Bureau. I was recently elected president of the Oahu Retail Food Dealers.

This background is presented to you to indicate that I take considerable interest in the affairs of the community in which I live.

In fact, so much that 4 years ago, I started a column of my own in the local newspapers that has gained island-wide fame. It is the only one of its kind in the Territory. A column of editorials of current events and news items of people in my community. It is called What's Cooking in Kalihi! Editorials by the newspapers were written about it. One calling me the Billy Rose of Kalihi.

In 1946 I was elected a member of the house of representatives on the Democratic ticket. This was my first try for public office and I got in by an overwhelming vote, coming in second place; my Democratic colleague who came in first was 25 votes ahead of me. This race was very interesting for me as well as everyone.

Six representatives were to be elected at large from the Fifth District of Honolulu. The so-called popular PAC (Political Action Committee) in the general election endorsed five of my Democratic colleagues and went over to the other side, the Republic side, to endorse the other candidate to complete their slate of six candidates. They tried their best to defeat me, but the people of my community saw fit and had the confidence in me to elect me as one of their six representatives.

Out of the PAC six candidates, only two were fortunate enough to be elected.

In the 1948 election, I did not care to run again for public office. The reasons were on account of pressure of my business and mostly on account of taking the highest office of my life, that of being married earlier. We have a son who is now 1 year 3 months.

I am now a member of the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention. In this race, two delegates were to be elected. Eleven candidates were seeking these two seats. I am proud to say again that the people of my community saw fit to elect me again, coming in first both in the primary and the final elections by an overwhelming vote.

In January of last year, 1949, I had the honor of receiving two certificates which I cherished very highly. One was for being chosen Man of the Week and the other one was for being one of a panel of five outstanding young men for the year 1948.

Stemming from generations of kamaainas, or "old-timers," and considering myself well advised in the ways of the small-business men of Hawaii, I have come here at my own expense to inform this committee that as a typical small-business man, I feel the granting of immediate statehood to Hawaii is imperative.

For over 50 years, Hawaii has been the stepchild of Uncle Sam. We feel that it is time that Hawaii should be treated in all respects like the other States of the Union. We all look forward to the day when Hawaii will be given the status of a State and entitled to all the rights, representation, privileges, and responsibilities of a State. We want to elect our Congressmen and Senators to the Congress of the United States and vote for our President.

Hawaii is known as the melting pot of races. In Hawaii, we of all races, creeds, and color mix and live happily together. Nowhere else under the American flag can any community compare with ours. Our boys of all races, colors, creeds, and ancestry fought for the principles of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We are loyal—just as loyal as any citizen in the 48 States. We want to be put on an equal basis; we want to share in the brotherhood of States.

We want to vote for our President, so we humbly pray and appeal to you, gentlemen, to act favorably on our petition to allow us to enter into the Union of States, and let us become proud citizens of the State of Hawaii.

Senators, I have here a sample of my column which came out in the early part of January, *What's Cooking in Kalihi*. And, Senators, here is an editorial that was written 3 years ago, in 1947.

Senator TAYLOR. We will make these exhibits, and they will be filed with the committee.

(The above newspaper articles were filed with the committee.)

Mr. KAM. Also I have here photostatic copies of the letters informing me about being chosen man of the week and one about the choice of one of a panel of five outstanding young men for the year 1948.

Senator TAYLOR. We will make these a part of the record.

HONOLULU, T. H., *January 21, 1949.*

MR. FRANK Y. KAM,
Honolulu, T. H.

DEAR MR. KAM: In behalf of the citizens' committee, as authorized by the junior chamber of commerce, it is my pleasure to inform you that you have been selected as one of a panel of five young men who rendered unusually meritorious civic service to your community during 1948. Your contribution to Honolulu is typical of the efforts of countless young people in Honolulu who are giving a portion of their time in an effort to make our city a better place in which to live.

May I extend to you sincere congratulations and wish you success in your future.

Very truly yours,

A. D. CASTRO,
Chairman of Citizens' Committee for Junior Chamber of Commerce
Distinguished Service Award.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF HONOLULU,
Honolulu 16, Hawaii, U. S. A., January 25, 1949.

MR. FRANK Y. KAM,
Honolulu, T. H.

DEAR MR. KAM: On behalf of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, I want to congratulate you on the occasion of your being selected as man of the week during the week ending January 21, 1949.

This weekly award which began with the week of April 9, is sponsored by the chamber of commerce through its American way committee to dramatize the life of a citizen in our community who, through enterprise, has risen to a position of responsibility. It is indeed an honor and privilege that you were selected as a typical American symbolic of the American way of living.

We also want to extend to you our sincere appreciation for your cooperation in assisting this committee to carry this message to the public.

Yours very truly,

PAUL H. ANDERSON, *President.*

MR. FARRINGTON. I want to make record of the fact that Alfred W. Chock is here as representative of the Central Labor Council of the American Federation of Labor. I do not believe he is at the hearings this afternoon, but he has been at most of the hearings to represent them in the event they were called.

I would like also to present for the record a statement by Mike Masaoka of the Japanese American Citizens League. He left earlier, I believe, and asked that that be presented.

Senator TAYLOR. Without objection, it will be made a part of the record.

(The statement of the Japanese American Citizens League is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF MIKE MASAOKA, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR OF THE JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE

The question of Hawaiian statehood is of particular interest to the Japanese American Citizens League, the only national organization of persons of Japanese ancestry, with 80 chapters and committees in 38 States and the District of Columbia.

There are two significant reasons for this interest. The first stems from the intimate, wartime association between the Nisei, Americans of Japanese ancestry, in the United States proper and the Nisei from Hawaii who served together in the Armed Forces.

The second is based upon Hawaii's large population of Asian ancestry. While this factor is not always referred to specifically, nevertheless over the years one of the major excuses for delaying statehood has been because of its varied ethnic composition. We feel this fact should be openly discussed here because, in the light of knowledge of Hawaii, its very population is one of the most compelling reasons for extending statehood to the Paradise of the Pacific.

During the war, the Nisei from Hawaii and the mainland lived and fought together as members of the famed Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team in Europe, in the Allied Translator and Interpreter Service in the Pacific, and serve together now with the Interpreter Service in the Army of Occupation in Japan.

Prior to 1941, the relationship between the mainland and Hawaiian Nisei was quite as casual as the normal relationship between any other group of citizens in the United States and Hawaii. But this was changed with the war.

Nisei who have spent their lives in the States, once knowing the Nisei in Hawaii only by reputation, now can testify personally and voluminously that the thousands of Nisei GI's from the islands were among the bravest and most loyal members of our Armed Forces.

Many of the Hawaiians first went into the army as National Guardsmen who composed the all-Nisei Hawaiian One Hundredth Infantry Battalion. Subsequently, the One-Hundredth was merged with the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team, similarly an all-Nisei organization made up of volunteers from both the mainland and Hawaii.

Between them, the Four Hundred and Forty-second and the One Hundredth have records without parallel in our military history. They won more awards and combat decorations for their length of service in the line than any other American military unit of comparable size in the last, or any previous war. The One Hundredth and Four Hundred and Forty-second fought exclusively in Italy and France, where they became famed as "the Purple Heart Regiment."

In the Pacific, thousands of mainland and Hawaiian Nisei served with equal distinction. While little was revealed of their activities during the war against the Japanese enemy for security reasons, much can be said in their praise today. General Willoughby, Chief of Staff for Intelligence under General MacArthur, credited the Nisei in the Pacific, mostly serving as combat-intelligence troops, with shortening the war against Japan by many months. To them he credited the saving of untold thousands of American lives and the conservation of billions of dollars.

Once the occupation of Japan began, additional thousands of Nisei from the mainland and Hawaii continued the vital work of serving as the eyes and ears—the interpreters and translators—of the Army. Their peacetime work, of course, does not lend itself to the color nor the drama of war service. But their work has ranged from the casual to the most sensitive.

Indeed, during and since the war, the mainland Nisei have come to know intimately, in training, in combat, and in occupation duty, the Nisei from Hawaii. We know them to be loyal to the America we love beyond question. We know they have served her faithfully. We know they see in the American flag the emblem of the only land to which they owe allegiance.

Before the test of war, there was speculation about the islands' mixed population. Usually, for purely racist reasons, it was misassumed that one of Asian ancestry could never be completely faithful to the United States; that some little understood gene or chromosome dictated prior to birth that such a person was oriented toward the East rather than the West.

In the case of the Chinese, the argument raised was that they owed first loyalty to their homeland. The Japanese supposedly paid unswerving allegiance to the Emperor of Japan. And, in the case of all Asians, they were allegedly unassimilable, either to democratic ideals or to the American way of life.

It took a major war and thousands of casualties before such myths were exposed for the sheer nonsense that they are.

By way of an example, immediately after Pearl Harbor, wild and distorted rumors were widely circulated that the Nisei on the islands engaged in extensive sabotage. In truth, not one case of sabotage or espionage ever was charged against an American of Japanese ancestry in Hawaii. Their loyalty, quite the opposite, was hailed repeatedly by both military and civilian investigative agencies.

What about the attitude of the Nisei in Hawaii on statehood? The overwhelming sentiment among them, as among the entire population, is for it. Before the war, Hawaiians voted more than 3 to 1 in favor of statehood. This percentage was ever higher among the Nisei. It is greater today.

Even now the citizens of Hawaii are holding a constitutional convention, drafting a constitution for the new State. This is perhaps the most significant illustration of all of their desires for immediate statehood.

The charge has been raised, but it is chiefly the same old lie cut to new cloth, that Hawaii is rife with Communists. We know, of course, what little truth there is in this baseless charge. If there were any basis of fact, obviously every congressional committee that has gone to Hawaii to study its readiness for statehood would have returned doubtful of the islands' preparedness. Instead, they have been unanimous in support of accepting Hawaii into the Union as a State.

None would deny there is some communism in the islands any more than one could close his eyes and declare there is no communism in the United States. But the Communists of Hawaii no more represent the people of the islands than do the Communists of the United States.

Here should be raised a serious point that bears critically upon the question of statehood and Communists.

To survive, communism needs dissatisfaction. It fattens on people that can be divided and disturbed. It spreads where there are unsolved truths which can be used to confuse people emotionally. It waxes on suspicion, distrust, and unhappiness.

Nowhere under the American flag is the practice of democracy more a reality than in Hawaii. Discrimination, as we know it, is virtually unhealed. Segregation is a concept that has never been raised. Those who live in Hawaii do so with more harmony than do peoples of mixed ethnic background anywhere in the United States.

Thus, at the outset, communism in Hawaii is denied one of its cogent arguments—fear and distrust by one people for another. But the Communists do have a latent argument that conceivably could gain strength with the passing years—the colonial status of the islands.

No educated people has yet submitted willingly to colonial rule. Since Hawaii has gained political maturity in the past generation, the Communists have, indeed, an argument they can use with increasing force. Hawaii's pressure for statehood yearly increases, largely as a result of policies of our own making. For this, we must accept the responsibility as well as the credit.

We cannot be so naive as to assume that the very denial of self-government—which we have taught Hawaii through the history and practices of democracy as the right of every man—can continue to generate good will toward the mainland. The Communists will realize this.

There should be no implication here that because Hawaii is not a State it may suddenly become a hostile Territory. But this committee must understand the long term dangers inherent in any policy which will continue to deny it equality in government.

In the eyes of Hawaiians—and it is only a natural feeling—they feel keenly their present status, with its evils of taxation without representation and absentee government. It is not too many years since Thirteen Colonies along the eastern seaboard went to war with England over such matters.

H. R. 49 provides for the admission of a State of one-half million people. In size, it would be as large as Connecticut and Rhode Island combined, almost as large as either Massachusetts or New Jersey. In population, it would rank above a dozen other States.

The argument has been raised that Hawaii is noncontiguous to the mainland and, per se, should be denied statehood for this fact. When the first States were admitted into the Union with the Original Thirteen, this Government enunciated a policy for all time that statehood was not dependent upon a precise location in space. Statehood for Hawaii, or for that matter, Alaska, is a continuing extension of a concept expounded almost 174 years ago and confirmed by more than a century of experience.

Actually, the same arguments about relative location were raised when the territories bordering and west of the Mississippi were proposed for statehood. It was argued they were too far removed from the seat of government; that originally the founding fathers never envisioned States stretching across the continent.

How distant is Hawaii? By air, it is 18 hours from Washington, and closer to the Capital City today than the stagecoach distance in time between Philadelphia and the District of Columbia.

Fortunately for the United States, the narrow views of those who fought extension of statehood never prevailed, else our Nation today would be a strip along the Atlantic seaboard instead of being the most powerful country on earth.

As each State came into the Union, it added to our greatness, contributed to our worthiness, and enriched the vigor of our democracy. Now let it not be argued that the addition of other stars can dim the brightness of our flag.

Particularly with respect to those of Asian ancestry, the myth of bloc voting has been raised. While less is heard about this now than in past years, there is sufficient misunderstanding and misinformation to warrant further analysis.

Perhaps the arguments of bloc voting can best be dispelled by our own experiences in California where, for years, we have seen persons of Japanese ancestry divide themselves politically along the same professional, economic, and job lines that usually mark a person's political beliefs. One of the outstanding examples of this was in the 1948 elections. Gov. Earl Warren, of California, was one of the significant spokesmen for the evacuation of persons of Japanese

ancestry from the west coast after the outbreak of the war. Yet, in the last general campaign many Nisei, for reasons stronger and further reaching than ethnic background, or even what may have happened to them personally in the evacuation, actively supported Governor Warren's candidacy as Republican Vice President and campaigned in his behalf.

In Hawaii, Nisei are prominent in both political parties. They have won high posts as Democrats and Republicans in the party organizations and as elected officials. It is by no means uncommon to find a Nisei Republican and a Nisei Democrat each seeking the same office, nor to find a Nisei representing a district composed largely of non-Japanese, nor to find non-Japanese representing districts in which persons of Japanese descent are predominant.

Among the Nisei of Hawaii, as with any other group, party politics and loyalties are based upon the same factors of daily living and knowledge as motivate any people to vote for the candidates of one party in preference to another. Hawaiians are well aware of this. Bloc voting has not been an issue there for a generation.

It has been pointed out that statehood for Hawaii will immeasurably increase the prestige of America in the Orient at a time when this is badly needed. Let us look into this more fully.

Hawaii is the connecting link between the United States and the Orient, the bridge between east and west. Its vital position as far as our relations with the Orient are concerned can be quickly established by recalling but one incident: When Japan sought to cripple us in Asia, it first bombed Hawaii.

More to be considered, though, is the attitude of the United States toward Asia as exemplified by what happens in Hawaii.

Because of its large population of persons of Asian ancestry, the treatment this Nation accords Hawaii is under constant scrutiny in Asia as reflecting the opinions and feelings of the United States toward Asiatics generally.

Were Congress to deny Hawaii statehood again, it would be interrupted in the Orient as a continuing attitude on our part that orientals are inferior peoples, and a reaffirmation of the racist principles this land enunciated under the Oriental Exclusion Act of 1924, a blow at the dignity of the Orient from which it still has not recovered and which, according to former Ambassador Joseph C. Grew, was a major factor in bringing World War II upon us.

After 2½ years' study, a special Senate subcommittee has prepared a bill, S. 3455, introduced by Senator Pat McCarran, which proposes to eliminate the vestigial remnants of oriental exclusion from our laws. The House already this Congress has passed such a measure—the Judd bill, H. R. 199, all of which indicates a growing awareness in Congress of the need for a clear and positive statement of democratic principles toward the Orient. It requires no Walter Lippman to interpret what use Communists on the far side of the Pacific would make of the fact that Hawaii again is denied statehood, especially when both political parties have promised it in their respective platforms.

Confer upon Hawaii the equality of statehood, and once and for all time we have proclaimed to the world and the Orient that we are in the Pacific to stay; that our destiny may be as closely linked with China and Japan and other nations of the Far East as it is to Europe; that in the philosophical concept of democracy, there is no place for superior and inferior peoples. This, manifestly, is positive democracy at its best.

Asia looms larger upon the American scene today than at any time since the end of hostilities. Up to this moment, we have been losing the cold war on the continent of Asia.

Even as the victorious march of our armies in the Pacific had to begin with Hawaii, so, too, we must—although in another sense—consider Hawaii the vital "line of departure" in the present conflict of ideologies in the Orient. For it well may be that what we do in Hawaii will be the key to the eventual success or failure of democracy itself throughout Asia.

Only illogically can we preach democracy to Japan on Korea, China or Burma, yet deny a Territory within our own front yard statehood because it has an Asian population.

And this must be made eminently clear: Regardless of whatever other arguments may be advanced, extension of statehood to Hawaii will, in the eyes of the Orient, be considered granted or denied only on the basis of our respect for the ideals of democracy as extended to the mixed peoples of Hawaii. Because of the world situation, this cannot be avoided.

Hawaii's desire for statehood has been brought before Congress 15 separate times since the islands were annexed. And what are these islands today? Models

of peaceful planning, of capable self-government, an integral and loyal part of the United States. The citizens pay taxes on the same Federal basis as other citizens, yet they have no vote either in levying Federal taxes or in their disbursement.

Such a condition is contrary to traditional American principles.

As Gov. Ingram M. Stainback, of Hawaii, appointed by the President to serve as chief executive in this Territory, recently said:

"No taxation without representation, no government without the consent of the governed, are axioms as much alive and as important to the people of Hawaii today as they were to the Revolutionary fathers who first gave them utterance, and these principles are particularly applicable when we remember the overwhelming mass of the residents of Hawaii are citizens of the United States, citizens whose loyalty, patriotism and ability in self-government cannot be questioned." Fifty-three years ago, when Hawaii exchanged her sovereignty for annexation, this Nation conferred upon her the rank of a Territory. Historically, territorial status has been considered schooling in the requirements of self-government—pupilage in the meaning of democracy.

Hawaii has remained a Territory much longer than necessary to prove, beyond question or doubt, that she has been an apt and worthy student; that she has long been ready for graduation, *summa cum laude*, into the ranks of the sister States of the Republic.

Statehood would be fitting recognition for the loyalty and allegiance of Hawaii to the United States; a compensation to her people for the taxes they have paid, the land they have built, and the lives they have given to our common destinies.

Mr. FARRINGTON. We have a statement to be presented for the record by Mr. Israel Weinstein, who served with the Jewish Welfare Board in Hawaii for many years. I think with that we will have concluded the presentation of all of our witnesses.

Senator TAYLOR. Mr. Weinstein.

STATEMENT OF ISRAEL WEINSTEIN, NEW YORK CITY

Mr. WEINSTEIN. I regret that I came straight from the train here and could only scribble a few notes on the way down. Since I am a resident of Long Island, N. Y., and am an ex-resident of Hawaii, I hope to go back to retire there one of those days. I thought I would like to come down as a disinterested friend and ex-resident to give the committee my impressions of having lived there 13 years.

My full name is Israel Weinstein, born in 1889 in Poland, and arrived in the United States in 1891. I was raised in Massachusetts, and then immigrated to California.

I was in the service from 1910 to 1919, through World War I; and then served with the United States Veterans' Administration, then the Veterans' Bureau, until I came to Hawaii in 1930, where I represented the Jewish Welfare Board from 1930 to 1940, and helped to organize the USO there, and sent into the field the first mobile unit of the USO with troops in the field of operations.

During that period I not only covered the work that was ordinarily done parallel to that of an Army and Navy YMCA secretary for the more than 500 men of the Jewish faith in the armed services, but also helped organize the small Jewish community of Honolulu, and established a center there for people and acted as an unofficial lay rabbi for the community, getting them largely organized until 1940, when the regular Army and Navy chaplains were brought into the field.

I then assumed the position of a coordinating officer and helped develop the work there, until recalled by the USO to take charge of the work in North Carolina. During that period I had an opportunity of getting to know the people of Hawaii intimately and very well.

In addition to the ordinary activities, I was very active in the American Legion, past commander of the Woodrow Wilson Post there, and helped organize later, about 1936, Diamond Head Post No. 13, and took part in most of the social service activities in the rehabilitation of veterans.

My most important contribution I consider there was extracurricular activities in organizing the unemployment service, sponsored by the United Veterans Service Council, representing all the veteran groups of Hawaii. This was financed by a championship Army and Navy baseball game through the good offices of General Wells and Admiral Yarnell, and Walter Dillingham, who at that time was the Department Commander of the American Legion.

This activity continued for 4 or 5 years under my chairmanship, and finally when I returned to the mainland I turned over those duties to Colonel Fitzpatrick. I mention those merely to show you how good an opportunity I had of observing all phases of life in Hawaii.

I do not know of any group of Americans who have ever displayed greater devotion to the various causes of Americanism, a firmer loyalty to American principles and political institutions, a finer and more sincere appreciation for American democracy, than the people of Hawaii. I am speaking of the consistent attitude of the people of Hawaii all during the peace years as well as later, during the war.

One of the greatest memories and thrills of my experience in the Islands was in acting as master of ceremonies for the celebration of Armistice Day in 1941. At that time hundreds of Hawaiian boys, most of them from McKinley High School, the graduating class of the ROTC, were paraded at Kapiolani Park, and there inducted into the service.

Out of that group came most of the men who later formed the famous One-Hundredth Battalion, whose record stands second to none in the Army.

What I want to mainly stress was the fact that the people of Hawaii, in general, when the blitz came, showed such devotion to the general cause, such patriotic fervor in offering themselves and all of their chattels and goods, disregarding every personal consideration, over an extensive period long after December 7. It was not merely the men who entered the service, but every businessman, every person in every walk of life.

Just simply recalling one incident, in organizing the feeding for the city, in which I had the privilege of helping—I went out of the palace and started looking for some help in setting up a makeshift kitchen, since there were no food stores of any sort available or any supplies circulating in the city.

I ran into the owner of one of the largest restaurants in town. I asked him what he was doing. He said nothing, he was just looking for an opportunity to help. I said, "You have got a job; come along with me." I took him up to the palace and he organized a cafeteria system which kept the Governor and his staff and everyone at headquarters in rations for the balance of the period until normal conditions developed some 10 days later.

As a disinterested friend of Hawaii, I want to say that I would like to add my plea to that of the people of Hawaii receiving favor-

able consideration, because I think they earnestly deserve it, since there are no finer group of Americans that I know anywhere. Thank you.

Senator TAYLOR. Thank you.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, that we are more than grateful for the patience and generosity you have shown in listening to this series of statements.

Senator TAYLOR. Delegate Farrington, we want to assure you, sir, that it has been a high privilege to listen to these witnesses. We have just concluded last week the hearings on Alaska. We were impressed with the pioneering spirit of those people.

That has always been displayed by Americans. I can truthfully say that I wish that every person in America could have been here to have seen and heard these things. It would have given them a great lesson, because race prejudice and other prejudices are not only confined to the South in this country of ours; they are all over the Nation.

I think if all Americans could have seen what those of us who are fortunate enough to be members of this committee have seen here, it would have been a wonderful object lesson to them. We have been impressed with the sincerity of these people, the fine appearance of them; and speaking for myself, and not for the committee, I want to say that I hope that we can get your bill out and make Hawaii a State.

Do you have anything to say, Senator Butler?

Senator BUTLER. Nothing, except that I have been delighted to have been able to take the time this week to attend the hearings. I have tried to be present at all meetings and I regret very much it was impossible for Senators Millikin and Watkins on the minority side to be here at any time. Senator Watkins is out in his home State of Utah, and Senator Millikin is the ranking member of the minority on the Finance Committee that has been hearing H. R. 6000, the social security bill in which we are all so much interested. They have been holding meetings daily. Otherwise he would have been here.

Like Senator Taylor, I want to assure you that we will do the utmost that we can for you.

Senator TAYLOR. In conclusion, I want to say that the Members of the Congress and the Senate hold your distinguished Delegate, Mr. Farrington, in the highest esteem. We also feel that you are very fortunate in having the services of former Senator Burke to represent you here. If statehood is granted, it will not be because you have not had proper representation, and it will not be because you people have not impressed us with your sincerity and the logic of your arguments.

Senator BUTLER. I do not think Senator Taylor or I want to give you the impression that we as individuals are going to have the say as to what the committee does. It is going to be up to the committee.

I can assure you that when we get into executive session, there will be nearly all, if not all, the members of the committee present, 13 members, with the exception of Senator Downey, who is quite ill in the hospital.

Mr. FARRINGTON. We will have a few additional documents to put in the record, if we may. Maybe we can clear those tomorrow morning. And we might have some supplementary material.

Senator BUTLER. I regret really very much that you did not bring along at least one or two who could express a dissenting view, because

you have dissenters out there. We know that by the votes that are cast. We would like to get a complete picture of the whole thing.

I have a pile of testimony that is bigger than has been submitted here, none of which I think that I will submit for the record, because in many cases the parties request that their names not be used. And of course testimony of that kind is not testimony; it is simply hearsay and would have no weight.

I may, however, decide to put into the record at the close tomorrow one or two statements that have come in. I want to say now that I do not want anybody to think that they represent my opinion. I shall put them in at the request of the party that sent the records in to be made part of the record.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, those in opposition had the opportunity to have come if they wished. One gentleman in opposition is presently in Washington, but declined to appear. Others that were in Honolulu had the same opportunity to come here as they wished.

I would like to stress the fact that the opposition is a very small minority in Hawaii, and they represent in some individual cases people of means who could have come here. May I also express my special appreciation of the courtesy and patience of the committee in listening to those of us who have come from Hawaii. I think we appreciate very much indeed the fact that you have given everyone an opportunity to appear in person and at least make a brief statement and file his written statements.

Senator TAYLOR. That will conclude the hearings for today, then. We will recess until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock in this room.

(Thereupon, at 7:20 p. m., the committee recessed until Friday morning, 10 a. m., May 5, 1950.)

HAWAII STATEHOOD

FRIDAY, MAY 5, 1950

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10 a. m., in room 224, Senate Office Building, Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney (chairman), presiding.

Present: Senators O'Mahoney, McFarland, Taylor, Ecton, Butler, and Millikin.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order, please.

Delegate Farrington, we are ready to proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, A DELEGATE TO CONGRESS FROM THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, my purpose this morning is to conclude the testimony of the proponents of statehood and ask for prompt enactment of H. R. 49.

At the outset, I want to introduce into the record certain information that has been requested during the course of these proceedings.

I wish to present for the information of the committee, to be filed possibly as an exhibit, the latest information on the economy of Hawaii and the unemployment problem, a report prepared by Dr. James H. Shoemaker, vice president, Bank of Hawaii. I believe he is carrying on this work for the Governor's unemployment committee. Some question was raised about that problem.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to have this made a part of the record?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I will follow the committee's wishes on that. I think it would be nice to incorporate it in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, it is one of the most important features of the whole question, and, if there is no objection, these two monographs, *The Economy of Hawaii Today*, and *A Summary Review of the Economy of Hawaii Today*, will be made part of the record.

(The monographs referred to are as follows:)

THE ECONOMY OF HAWAII TODAY

A PRELIMINARY STUDY OF OUR PRESENT ECONOMIC POSITION WITH ESTIMATES OF INCOME AND EXPENDITURE AND A BRIEF REVIEW OF MEASURES NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE POST-WAR READJUSTMENT

(Prepared by James H. Shoemaker, vice president, Bank of Hawaii; Director of Department of Business Research)

In October of last year we announced the development of a research department under the direction of James H. Shoemaker. We promised at that time to make available to the people of Hawaii the results of the studies of this new department.

This booklet is the first report on the economy of Hawaii. Certainly it does not disclose a favorable position for the Territory. But it is the truth insofar as we have been able to discover it. And we believe, in presenting this report, that the people of Hawaii want the truth, for it is only on the basis of facts that constructive programs can be developed to improve the basic conditions that affect all of us.

We have no intention of stopping our studies with this report. We intend to go on with a sincere determination to point the way to sound corrective measures to assure a reversal of the unfavorable trends that have caused our present condition.

Our economic position, while unfavorable, is not yet dangerous. But it can be if we don't do something about it. Nature has given Hawaii tremendous resources. It is our job to use them to provide all of us a fuller opportunity.

To strengthen Hawaii's economy is the job of every organization, every unit of government, every single individual whose stake is here in Hawaii.

We intend to help in every practical way we can.

E. W. CARDEN,
President, Bank of Hawaii.

MAY 1, 1950.

OUR PRESENT ECONOMIC POSITION—A SUMMARY

I. Hawaii was the last important island area of the Pacific to be discovered and the first to be modernized. In the process of becoming a modern American community, Hawaii also changed from a primitive, diversified, self-sufficient economy to a highly specialized economy, tightly geared to mainland markets. Over nine-tenths of the dollar volume of the equipment and consumer goods necessary to maintain the present industries and standards of living in the Territory are purchased from the mainland.

To obtain the mainland dollars to buy these things, Hawaii sells—

- (1) Services to the armed forces, to tourists, and to steamship and airlines.
- (2) Sugar, based on scientific mass production methods, on mainland refining and marketing arrangements established by the Hawaiian sugar industry, and on a quota system established by the Federal Government.
- (3) Pineapples, based on equally efficient mass production and marketing methods.

These three items represent over 95 percent of the power of Hawaii to buy mainland products. Minor exports and income on Hawaiian investments on the mainland account for the remainder.

II. Because of its dependence on mainland production for the bulk of its equipment and consumer goods, the population and the standard of living that Hawaii can maintain is heavily dependent on the volume of mainland dollars that this economy can earn.

III. If we earn more mainland dollars than we spend to buy mainland goods and services, the surplus can be used in any of the following ways:

- (a) To increase capital investment in Hawaii (in plantation equipment, public utilities, hotels, commercial buildings, etc.).
- (b) To increase the financial strength of Hawaii.
- (c) To raise standards of living in Hawaii—more motorcars, telephones, electric appliances, etc.

If our earning power in mainland dollars declines, capital investment in Hawaii will decrease and standards of living will fall. Under these conditions there also will be a rise in unemployment because the level of productive activity in the Territory will be insufficient to provide jobs for all of the labor force.

IV. At the present time (1950) the economy of Hawaii is out of balance in two respects:

- (1) We are spending more mainland dollars than we are earning.
- (2) Our labor force exceeds the total number of job opportunities. (As of March 1950, there were 29,985 unemployed persons.)

V. The evidence of this lack of balance is to be found in:

- (a) A rapidly rising volume of unemployment over the past 2 years (1948-49).
- (b) A corresponding rise in relief costs and in demands on the Territorial Government for additional funds for this purpose.
- (c) An excessive outmigration (24,000 persons left the Territory in 1949).
- (d) Other factors, including declines in the value of real estate and local securities.

VI. The means for dealing with the problems we face are available. To fully develop them we require:

(1) An emergency employment program consisting of (a) Community action, (b) Territorial action, and (c) Federal action.

(2) A long range development program designed to (a) expand the unused water and land resources of the Territory, (b) develop the byproducts of our basic industries, (c) increase tourist trade, (d) stimulate the local production of foods that we have been importing from the mainland, (e) expand minor exports and (f) develop new export fields.

The purpose of this document is to present facts to support these conclusions.

I. THE ECONOMY OF HAWAII—Basis FEATURES

HAWAII—AN AREA OF SPECIALIZED PRODUCTION

An economy is the result of the adaption of a community to the conditions in which it exists as truly as vegetation represents an adaptation to the climate and the soil in which it grows. A Honolulu in Pennsylvania or a Pittsburgh in Hawaii would be equally unthinkable. Before the beginning of the war the economy of Hawaii had achieved a successful adaptation to the rigid framework of conditions which have determined its character. These conditions are—

1. A geographic position in the Pacific which provides (a) a base for world commerce, (b) an outpost for our armed forces and (c) a center for tourists; thus making services (to shipping, to the armed forces and to tourists) an important "invisible export."

2. The lack of industrial minerals or oils which has restricted industry to agricultural and marine products.

3. The sharp variations in topography, rainfall, and soil which has restricted land cultivation to one-tenth of the total land area.

4. The combination of a large supply of ground water and of constant summer weather which makes possible a year-round and remarkably intensive cultivation of that land which is arable.

5. A complex population of widely variant and predominantly Oriental races which provides the manpower on which the economy must rely.

6. The close administrative and trade connections with the mainland which have made the Hawaiian economy an integral part of the American economy as a whole.

Under these conditions the economic life of the Territory has been channeled toward sugar and pineapples, toward a unification of plantation policies, in order to obtain the advantage of agricultural mass production, and toward those economic and political relations with the mainland which would provide the basis for stability and the sound growth of Hawaiian industry.

To obtain construction materials, clothes, shoes, motorcars, fuel, plantation equipment, fertilizer, and other items necessary to the maintenance of present standards (including two-thirds of the food consumed in the Territory) Hawaii possesses (1) sugar, (2) pineapples, and (3) services (to shipping, to the armed forces, and to tourists). These three items represent over nine-tenths of the power of the Territory to buy mainland products and services.

Within the Territory economic activity is heavily dependent on these three primary industries. The production of cans exists because of the pineapple industry; the heavy machinery concerns and iron works are primarily for the servicing of plantation equipment; structural insulation board is a byproduct of the sugar industry; fertilizer processing and distribution are dependent upon the plantations; and nearly all local enterprises (such as hotels, restaurants, amusements, stores and laundries) are in part dependent on armed service personnel and tourist trade.

It should be noted that a large proportion of the employment and the volume of business in Hawaii is purely internal in the sense that it is concerned with the every day needs of residents and does not directly affect the balance of payments' relationship with the mainland. Except insofar as they serve tourists, the bus lines, the telephone system, the garages, the wholesale and retail concerns, etc., are "derivative" industries. They are essential to the functioning of our economy but they do not add to the power of Hawaii to buy mainland products to meet the needs of residents here. Standards of living in Hawaii, however, depend heavily upon our capacity to buy mainland products; and our capacity to buy mainland products in turn is dependent upon the volume of our exports.

Our local trade and service industries are thus dependent on our exports¹ industries in three respects:

1. The machinery, wiring, piping, transport, and other equipment (including even basic construction materials (essential to their operations require mainland dollars which accrue to Hawaii only by virtue of exports.

2. Broadly speaking, the population the Territory can maintain is proportionate to the volume of consumer and capital goods that can be obtained from the mainland, which is dependent on the volume of our exports. The size of our trade and service industries, in turn, is directly dependent upon the number of customers.

3. A higher per capita volume of exports means a higher standard of living here, that is, a greater per capita use of imported shoes, clothing, motorcars, telephones, electrical appliances, etc. The result is more employment in trade and services (more employees per thousand of our population in these industries).

For these reasons, in the long run, the size of our trade and service industries (and the total volume of employment in them) is heavily dependent on the volume of our exports. If the mainland dollars accruing to Hawaii exceed our expenditures for mainland products and services, there will be a gradual growth of funds for capital investment here. If, on the other hand, our income in mainland dollars is exceeded by our expenditures, there will be a gradual depletion of resources which, in the end, will result in lowering levels of employment and standards of living.

II. OUR ACCOUNT WITH THE MAINLAND—THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS POSITION OF HAWAII

The higher the degree of specialization in any given area, the greater is its dependence on trade with other areas. The extreme dependence of Hawaii on mainland markets is the result of the very highly specialized character of our economy. The "balance of payments statement" covering our account with the mainland is therefore a fundamental index of the strength of Hawaii's economic position.

Insofar as as the exports and imports of actual commodities are an indication, Hawaii enjoyed a favorable "balance of trade" until the late thirties. It is probable that the "balance of payments" (which includes both visible and invisible items) was even more favorable because of the sale of Hawaiian services to the armed forces and to tourists for mainland dollars. This excess of income over expenditure produced a rise in assets and in capital investment in Hawaii.

In 1938 the total value of the goods imported into the Territory began to exceed the value of the Hawaiian products exported to the mainland. The added imports were due to the expansion of defense installations in Hawaii. This trend grew rapidly after 1940 and by 1944 the value of imported goods was more than twice the value of the export of Hawaiian products. Under normal conditions this would be alarming because it would indicate a serious drain on the financial resources of the Territory leading eventually to unemployment and lower standards of living.

The unfavorable balance of trade (that is, the great excess of imported goods over exported goods) which developed after 1938 did not, however, represent a depletion of financial reserves in Hawaii. On the contrary, the sale of goods and services in Hawaii to the Federal Government created an income of mainland dollars that more than covered our trade deficit. These payments from Washington included (1) direct expenditures of the Government through the Army and Navy to buy construction materials here, (2) indirect expenditures of the Government through wages paid to Hawaiian workers (and workers imported from the mainland) which were spent to buy food, liquor, curios, and the services of laundries, transport facilities, and places of amusement, and (3) similar pur-

¹Services to the armed forces and to tourists are included here as "invisible exports." Such services are sold for mainland dollars and are thus income-producing in the same sense as are the exports of Hawaiian products. There are numerous "invisible items" which vitally affect our account with the mainland. On the credit side these include the goods and services which we sell in Hawaii to the armed forces and to tourists, interest and dividends on mainland investments by Hawaiian firms or residents, all of which are paid to us in mainland dollars. On the debit side are numerous claims of areas outside of the Territory of Hawaiian dollars, including Federal taxes, insurance premiums, expenditures of Hawaiian residents visiting the mainland or of students from Hawaii in mainland universities, interest and dividends that must be paid to mainland individuals or firms with investments in Hawaii, and claims on Hawaii that arise out of remittances to the Philippines, Japan, and other areas. In the case of Hawaii, these "invisible items" are large and play a more important role than in most economies.

chase by the Army, Navy, and Air Force personnel. In addition to these direct and indirect Federal expenditures, mainland dollars were also provided by the expenditures of the USO, the Red Cross, and other such agencies serving the Armed Forces.

Thus throughout the war years, the mainland dollars accruing directly or indirectly to Hawaii greatly exceeded the claims against the economy of the Territory for Hawaiian dollars. Although exact figures covering Federal expenditures here during the chaotic months following Pearl Harbor are not (and probably never will be) available because it was impossible to maintain accurate records then, the evidence that the "balance of payments" was favorable to Hawaii is clear and unmistakable. The rapid rise in armed service personnel, not to mention the mainland workers stationed here during the war, caused an unprecedented demand for Hawaiian goods and services. With few exceptions enterprises in the Territory received a sharp impetus in activity and experienced an increase in profits. The war demand for civilian workers created and acute shortage of labor so that many persons not normally employed joined the labor force, thus swelling the volume of Hawaiian services which were being sold to bring in mainland dollars. By 1945 bank deposits in Hawaii (excluding Government deposits) had risen to 3½ times their prewar level. An important economic effect of the war was thus an increase in the financial reserves held by individuals and business concerns throughout the Territory.

Since the importation of defense materials (for maintenance of installations and for members of the Armed Forces) declined sharply after the end of the war, it might be assumed that the volume of goods imported into Hawaii in the postwar years of 1946 to 1948 would show a marked decline. On the contrary, the importation of mainland goods during these postwar years was well above the average for the war years. The import of mainland goods reached an all-time high in 1947 and amounted to double the annual average for the years 1942 to 1944, inclusive.² The reason for this sharp rise was that the large accumulation of consumer buying power (combined with an acute shortage of certain types of goods and materials during the war years, in particular motorcars, plantation equipment, public utility equipment, radios, and electrical appliances) created such a pent-up demand that there was a marked rise in the purchase of these mainland products as soon as war restrictions were lifted.

The excess of imports over exports after 1945 thus represents a sharp change in our "balance of payments" position. The mainland dollars accruing to Hawaii from the Federal Government were declining rapidly, whereas the volume of Hawaiian dollars that were being expended to buy mainland products was increasing sharply. Thus, from a "favorable balance of payments" position during the war years, we have been rapidly trending toward an "unfavorable balance of payments" position. In terms of current income and current expenditures, we have been "going into the red." Just as no family or business can long remain solvent if it is spending more than it is earning, so no economy can continue indefinitely to spend more than it earns.

While it must be assumed that there will be a decline in the importance of mainland goods (particularly in plantation equipment, public utility equipment, motorcars, and electrical appliances) as the pent-up demand resulting from the war is satisfied, there are nevertheless reasons for assuming that this unbalanced situation will persist unless positive action is taken to bring the economy into a balance.

The reason for this assumption is that we must now import the shoes, clothes, fuel, transport equipment, medical supplies, etc. (and, as the economy of Hawaii is now operating, 65 percent of the food), for 132,000 more persons now living in the Territory than were here in 1940. Our basic exports, on the other hand, have not appreciably increased over their prewar levels.

1949 BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

This view is supported by a preliminary estimate of our income and expenditure of mainland dollars during 1949. Such a statement is necessarily based on a series of estimates and approximations; hence can never be computed with the accuracy of a bank statement or an accountant's balance sheet. While the over-all aggregates of income and of expenditure may be considered substantially correct, it should be noted that a small percentage of error in these aggregates

² These figures refer to the value of items that passed through trade channels only. They exclude military equipment and supplies that were handled exclusively by the armed services and hence were not included in the trade figures of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

produces a considerable margin of error in the difference between the two. (See pp. 10, 11.)

We have already noted that a marked increase in population over the past decade has been the basic long-run factor in the growth of a negative "balance of payments" position. This is accentuated by the present high rate of population growth in the Territory. During the past 2 years (1948 and 1949) the annual excess of births over deaths has amounted to 11,441 or at the rate of 953 per month.

In the year which lies immediately ahead of us, other basic factors influencing our balance-of-payments position are as follows:

1. 1949 droughts in certain parts of the Territory have affected pineapple production which may result in a less than normal export and thus decrease the volume of mainland dollars accruing to the Territory from this source during the year.

2. The level of employment of civilians (and of expenditure) by the armed forces in Hawaii is still above the 1940 level and, in view of the Federal economy drive, there is no guarantee that there will not be further cut-backs in the military establishment here during the coming months.

3. Throughout the first 4 months of 1950 the tourist trade has been maintained at a considerably higher than normal level. Should this continue, our income due to the sale of goods and services to tourists for mainland dollars will be considerably higher than normal.

Balance of payments between Hawaii and the mainland, 1949

In 1949, we earned mainland dollars in the following manner:

INCOME

1. We sold goods and services in Hawaii for mainland dollars, amounting to-----	\$205,343,000
(a) To the Federal Government (the armed forces and the civilian agencies) we sold goods and services amounting to-----	174,926,000
(b) To tourists we sold goods and services amounting to approximately-----	25,000,000
(c) To shipping and airlines and to other mainland concerns in Hawaii we sold goods and services amounting to-----	5,417,000
2. We exported Hawaiian products for mainland dollars, amounting to-----	212,466,000
(a) Our gross income from the sale of sugar and pineapples amounted to-----	205,520,000
(b) The aggregate value of our export of coffee, canned fish, wallboard, and flowers and foliage amounted to-----	5,091,000
(c) The export of macadamia nuts, papaya, lauhala ware, woodware, curios, etc., brought us approximately-----	1,855,000
3. We obtained a total additional income in mainland dollars (including returns on Hawaiian capital invested on the mainland or abroad, and numerous other minor forms of income) of about-----	10,905,000

Thus our total income in mainland dollars was----- 428,714,000

In 1949 we spent our money for the following purposes:

EXPENDITURES

1. We bought goods amounting to-----	\$324,786,000
(a) From the mainland we purchased food, clothing, shoes, motorcars, plantation equipment, fertilizers, public utility equipment, fuel, gasoline, electrical supplies, medical supplies, and many other items, amounting to-----	307,612,000
(b) From foreign countries we bought goods amounting to-----	17,174,000

Balance of payments between Hawaii and the mainland, 1949—Continued

EXPENDITURES—continued

2. For the services of mainland and foreign concerns, we paid----	\$58, 026, 000
(a) The largest expenditure for service was for ocean freight, amounting to-----	28, 737, 000
(b) The second largest item was for transportation and other services to Hawaiian residents while outside of the Territory amounting to ¹ -----	16, 681, 000
(c) Other services, including insurance (net cost), mainland advertising, motion pictures, etc., amounted to-----	12, 608, 000
3. We made payments to the Federal Government, amounting to--	93, 670, 000
(a) We paid in Federal taxes-----	90, 824, 000
(b) Postal services cost us-----	2, 846, 000
4. We paid in interest, dividends and profits to mainland or foreign concerns with investments in Hawaii approximately-----	10, 135, 000
5. Payments of dues, fees, and gift remittances to families on the mainland, in Japan, Korea, the Philippines and elsewhere, amounted to-----	6, 819, 000
6. Nearly 24,000 persons left Hawaii in 1949 and took with them approximately ² -----	11, 300, 000
Thus our total expenditures in 1949 amounted to-----	504, 736, 000
Since our total income was only-----	428, 714, 000

We spent more mainland dollars than we earned in 1949,
in the amount of----- 76, 022, 000

¹ About \$4,400,000 for return of residents to the mainland. Not a recurring item.

² Not a normally recurring item but outmigration is continuing at a high level in 1950.

4. If outmigration continues at the rate at which it has persisted since March 1949, there will be some decline in the total requirement for consumer goods from the mainland. Because of outmigration it also is possible that there will be an over-all decline in the number of unemployed for the year 1950 in spite of the fact that an estimated 5,622³ high school and college graduates are added to those seeking employment.

5. The 1949 importation of goods amounted to an average of \$51.65 per month for every man, woman and child in the Territory. It should be noted, however, that the total import figure (from which this average was derived) includes many items that cannot be considered consumer goods. Fertilizer, tin plate, plantation equipment, and many other items constitute imports necessary to basic production. There were also imports of construction materials and public utility equipment. The indications during the first quarter of 1950 are that there has been a diminution in the volume of imports. A decline of \$12 per month per capita would result in a reduction in our expenditures for exports equivalent to the total balance of payments deficit of 1949. It appears probable that certain types of importation (such as plantation equipment, public utility equipment, motor cars and construction materials) will decline in volume. Because of, (1) the decline in population, (2) a reduction in the volume of demand of luxury items, and (3) greater economy in the purchase of consumer goods due to a large volume of unemployment; it is probable that there also will be a reduction in the total importation of consumer goods. Thus it appears certain that the decline in imports will be substantial, but it is not possible at this time to determine whether the resultant decrease in our expenditure of mainland dollars will be large enough to overcome the deficit in our account with the mainland.

While a marked decrease in total imports would have the desirable effect of bringing our account with the mainland into balance and thus stabilizing our financial position in that respect, it would require difficult adjustments

³ This figure is based on the assumption that 35 percent of our graduates because of marriage, additional schooling, or for other reasons will not be seeking employment. There are 5,617 prospective graduates in the senior classes of our public high schools: 1,095 in private and parochial schools; and approximately 1,000 in vocational schools. Seniors in the University of Hawaii total 682. Of the 1,277 Hawaiian students now attending mainland schools presumably at least a fifth will come back into the life of the community. The estimated total number of graduates is thus 8,649.

within our island economy. Internal readjustment to a contracting volume of economic activity is always painful. For a time at least it would accentuate rather than diminish our employment problems.

Expressed in its simplest terms, we are faced with the necessity of reducing our imports and standards of living to conform to the level of our total present productive output unless we take positive action to expand production and our capacity to earn mainland dollars so as to sustain our total population at present standards of living.

III. MANPOWER AND JOBS—THE RELATION BETWEEN POPULATION AND PRODUCTIVITY IN HAWAII

The ratio of total population to total production is the most fundamental measure of the strength and soundness of an economy. A more immediate (and a closely related) measure lies in the relation between total labor force and total actual employment. An analysis of the relative growth of population and production will reveal the causes of the present lack of balance as between manpower and jobs—the reasons for the sharp rise in unemployment during the past 24 years.

PARALLEL GROWTH OF INDUSTRY AND POPULATION, 1872–1930

The population of Hawaii was estimated to be 300,000 in 1778 when these islands were discovered. There was a continuous decline until 1872, when the population reached an all-time low of 56,897, followed by over three-quarters of a century of population growth to an all-time high of 541,853 in March 1949.⁴ Thus in the last 78 years there has been an almost tenfold increase in the population of Hawaii.

During the first six decades of this period there was a parallel expansion of population and sugar production. Sugar production rose from an annual output of 10,000 tons in the early seventies to over 1,000,000 tons in 1930. These parallel trends culminated in the decade of the twenties. Between 1920 and 1930 there was an increase of over 100,000 in the population (39 percent), accompanied by an equally remarkable increase in the sugar, pineapple, and tourist industries. Sugar production in 1920 amounted to 546,273 tons, whereas in 1930 it amounted to 1,018,047 tons. Pineapple production rose from 5,986,982 cases in 1920 to 12,672,296 cases in 1930. The number of tourists who visited Hawaii was 9,676 in 1922 and 18,651 in 1930. Thus, from 1872 until the end of the twenties the rapidly increasing labor force was supported by an equally rapid expansion of employment in the export industries of the Territory.

THE CHANGE IN THE BASIC TREND IN EXPORT INDUSTRIES AFTER 1930

During the following decade, however, there was a sharp divergence between the growth of population and the growth of the basic industries of the Territory. Annual sugar production was very high (about a million tons during the years 1930 to 1932, but this 3-year record was never again surpassed. Pineapple production experienced same sharp ups and downs during the decade. The tourist industry showed a gradual expansion, but even as late as 1940 still provided only a small percentage of the mainland dollars accruing to the Territory. It is, therefore, clear that in the thirties there was the beginning of an employment problem in the sense that population continued to expand, whereas the basic industries were leveling off. This divergence was accentuated by the fact that both the sugar and the pineapple industries were mechanizing at such a rate that since 1930 there has been a marked decline in the number of jobs available in these basic industries.

WHY A CRITICAL EMPLOYMENT PROBLEM DID NOT DEVELOP BEFORE THE WAR

This sharp change in the basic position of the export industries of Hawaii was evidenced (a) by the excess of departures over arrivals (primarily Filipinos) during the decade so that the total population growth of 1930–40 was less than a third of that of 1920–30, and (b) by the development of some minor employment problems (partly due to the world-wide depression of the early thirties and partly due to declining employment in Hawaii's basic industries).

⁴ This is an extraordinarily rapid increase amounting to 11 times the rate of growth of the world's population for the same period. Rapid population growth continues to be a basic factor in the current economic problems of the Territory. The population of the United States has grown at a more rapid rate than that of the world, yet the percentage rate of growth of Hawaii since 1920 has been nearly three times that of the nation as a whole.

For two reasons unemployment during the thirties did not become as serious as it might otherwise have been. The first of these was that wages were increasing and standards of living were rising. Under these conditions, there is always movement of population from rural to urban areas and an increase in the number of workers attracted into trade and service industries (such as retail establishments, public utilities, laundries, restaurants, amusements, garages, filling stations, and electrical appliances). Hawaii was no exception. There was a marked increase in the number of workers flowing into these occupations during the thirties, accompanied by a marked movement from rural areas to Honolulu.

The second reason was that the tensions between the United States and Japan, which began with the invasion of Manchuria in 1931, gradually rose throughout the thirties, resulting in a gradual increase in the military establishment in Hawaii. This trend rose sharply after the Japanese invasion of China in 1937. By 1940 there were over 8,000 civilian employees of the Federal Government, representing an annual payroll of more than \$17,000,000.

Thus the trend toward trade and service industries and the expansion of the military establishment obscured the fact that during the decade of the thirties the long-term parallel growth of basic industries and population had ended. The expanding civilian employment by the armed services could not be considered normal or permanent. Hence prior to the war there was already a widening gap between the total labor force and total permanent employment in Hawaii.

INTERMEDIATE FACTORS—1940 EFFECTS OF THE WAR

One of the first effects of the war was to divert labor to defense activities and thus to create an acute shortage of manpower. The volume of employment in the sugar industry continued downward without any appreciable change in the downward trend which had already developed in the thirties. With the exception of 1943 there was also a downward trend in employment in the pineapple industry throughout the war years. The tourist industry as a source of income to the Territory disappeared entirely between December 7, 1941, and 1946, revived sharply in 1948, but suffered a relapse in 1949 due to the long water-front strike.

Hence a primary effect of the war was to accentuate the sharp divergence between increasing manpower and the number of permanent job opportunities in the Hawaiian export industries. The rapid rise in the employment of civilians by the armed services not only absorbed the slack but created such intense demands for labor that housewives and even many of those who would normally have been in high school were absorbed in wartime employment. At its wartime peak employment in Hawaii exceeded 200,000. The presence of military personnel in very large numbers led to an expansion in the trade and service industries. For these reasons earnings in mainland dollars accruing to Hawaii arose rapidly.

It would thus appear logical to expect unemployment to develop immediately following the war because the number of enlisted men and officers in Hawaii decreased markedly and the employment of civilians by the armed forces was sharply curtailed. An unemployment problem did not arise at that time, however, for the following reasons:

1. Although civilian employment by the armed services was reduced throughout 1946 and 1947, it did not decline to prewar levels. At the end of 1947 it was still four times as great as it had been in 1940.

2. The vast war expenditures of the Federal Government (the greatest of any government at any time in history) created an inflationary situation throughout the United States. Because Hawaii was a focal point of wartime activity the inflationary effects on the relatively small economy of the Territory were far more pronounced than they were for the country as a whole. At the same time, because of the war, it was not possible to purchase many needed items such as equipment for the plantations, motorcars, and electric refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, and stoves. At the end of the war there was a pent-up demand backed by buying power which led to unusually high levels of activity in the purchase of these things. Thus there was a postwar boom in trade, service industries, and in public utilities.

3. Throughout the war period construction was confined to defense installations. Hence there was an extreme shortage of housing and commercial buildings when the war ended. This resulted in a postwar boom as soon as construction materials for private construction became available. The volume of employment in the construction industry doubled during the first year after the war ended.

4. Because of the profitability of trade and service enterprises (and the sharp impact of consumer demand as soon as war restrictions were lifted) there was a marked expansion in small- and medium-sized trade and service enterprises after the war. Hence there also was a rise in the number of self-employed in the Territory during this period.

In short, the influences affecting employment between 1940 and 1948 were chaotic and uncertain but were generally sharply upward. Federal employment was by far the most important type of employment in the Territory from 1942 to 1946, inclusive. Throughout 1946 and 1947 the decline in Federal employment was fully absorbed by a boom in the trade and service industries and in public utilities.

During the decade of the forties, however, our basic export industries—sugar, pineapples, and services to tourists—showed no appreciable advance. The production of sugar and pineapples declined during the war and returned to prewar levels following the war. The volume of employment in these industries continued downward due to mechanization. The tourist industry completely disappeared between 1941 and 1946 and did not regain its prewar importance until 1948.

Meantime, between 1938 and 1950 Hawaii experienced the most rapid population growth in its entire history.⁵ This added population was not sustained by normal export industries but by types of employment which were by their nature temporary—(1) by the construction and maintenance of defense installations during the preparedness period prior to December 7, 1941; (2) by the vast expenditures and the employment of civilians by the Federal Government here during the war; and (3) by the boom in trade and construction following the war due to the postwar outpouring of consumer buying power which accumulated in Hawaii during the war.

THE RECENT RISE IN UNEMPLOYMENT—THE CHANGES OF 1948-49

At the beginning of 1948 the amount of unemployment in Hawaii was not abnormal, amounting to 4,000. By the end of the year it had risen to over 13,000. Throughout 1949 there was an accelerated increase, and by the end of that year it exceeded 33,000.

The immediate causes were (1) a sharp decline in the employment of civilians by the Federal Government and in the military personnel stationed in Hawaii; (2) the long water-front strike of 1949; (3) the return of demand for certain types of consumer goods to more normal levels; and (4) the end of the postwar boom in private construction. The underlying causes of unemployment, however, are to be found in the long-run trends which began early in the decade of the thirties, as previously explained.

The effect of the economic changes of 1948-49 was thus to reveal the basic economic maladjustments that have been developing in the Territory during the past two decades. The lack of balance as between manpower and jobs and the lack of balance in our account with the mainland are both traceable to the same fundamental cause—since 1930 there has been relatively little expansion in our basic export industries whereas the population has continued to rise rapidly.

SUMMARY

1. From 1872 to 1930 there was a parallel expansion of the basic export industries and the total labor force. Throughout this period the expansion of Hawaiian industry afforded full support for Hawaii's growing population.

2. After 1930 employment in these industries declined whereas manpower continued to expand. There was thus a divergence between job opportunities in our basic industries and the total labor force.

3. During the thirties, however, there was a marked increase of employment in trade and service industries because of rising wages and standards of living. This, together with the added employment due to the expansion of the military

⁵ Between December 7, 1941, and 1943 chaotic war conditions and the rapid movement of civilian and military personnel into and out of Hawaii made it impossible to maintain dependable population records. Later the Territorial department of health (bureau of vital statistics) reestablished a basic population figure on the basis of estimates. Current official population figures projected from this base necessarily include any error in these estimates. The figures to be provided by the 1950 census may indicate a considerable revision in the figures given in this document.

The continuing marked outmigration of 1949-50 means that the figure given here is declining. If, in addition, the 1950 census shows our actual population to be considerably less than the estimated population, it will be an encouraging indication that the lack of balance in our economy is less marked than these figures would imply.

establishment in Hawaii after 1935, absorbed the excess manpower that would otherwise have been unemployed.

4. The imperative wartime demand for workers after 1941 created an acute shortage of labor. This was accentuated as business profits and the earnings of labor rose, thus accelerating the rise in the standards of living and the further growth in trade and service industries. On the other hand, the war did not alter the long-term downward trend of employment in our export industries. By causing a more than normal growth in population, the war accentuated the divergence between total manpower and total permanent employment opportunities in the Territory.

5. During the war there was a rapid rise in consumer buying power, accompanied by a virtual cessation of supply of motorcars, radios, electric appliances, and similar consumer goods. Hence buying power accumulated unspent. When wartime restrictions were lifted, this created an inflation and a postwar boom in the trade and service industries.

6. Because building was limited to military construction during the war there was an equally acute shortage in dwellings and commercial buildings which resulted in a postwar boom in construction.

7. Thus four factors prevented a serious decline in employment following the war:

(a) For a time the military establishment was maintained at considerably higher than prewar levels.

(b) The pent-up consumer demand which was released at the end of the war led to an increase of employment in trade and service industries.

(c) The postwar building boom led to an increase in employment of construction workers.

(d) A sharp rise in the number of small business establishments led to an increase in the number of self-employed.

8. For these reasons the economy of the Territory did not begin to face the basic problems of postwar economic readjustment until after the beginning of 1948. Since that time there have been far sharper cutbacks in civilian employment by the armed forces. The return of consumer demand and construction to more normal levels has tended to reduce the volume of employment. The long water-front strike of 1949 sharply accentuated the problem.

9. These developments, however, were not the fundamental cause of our present unemployment problem. On the contrary, the prewar preparedness program, the wartime employment of civilians, and the postwar booms must be considered as temporary. The decline of these marked, but temporary, influences has revealed the fact that throughout this period our population has rapidly outgrown our industrial base. We, therefore, require an emergency employment program to keep our economy in balance during the time needed to expand production and exports in order to provide full support for our present population and permanent employment of our labor force.

IV. SOME RESULTS OF THE LACK OF ECONOMIC BALANCE—OUR PRESENT POSITION AND OUTLOOK

The results of the lack of balance as between basic production and total population are evident in (a) unemployment, (b) rising relief costs, (c) declining financial reserves, (d) outmigration, and (e) other factors (including declines in private construction and in real-estate values).

A. UNEMPLOYMENT

According to estimates of the Territorial employment service as of February 1, 1950, unemployed in Hawaii stood at 33,451 as compared to 32,432 on January 1. On February 1, as between islands, there were 25,507 unemployed on Oahu (18.5 percent of the Oahu labor force), 3,544 on Hawaii (41.1 percent), 3,050 on Maui (17.3 percent), and 1,350 on Kauai (10.3 percent). Throughout February and March remained about the same on Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai—but declined on Oahu primarily because of outmigration.

In general this unemployed group is a representative cross-section of the labor force of the Territory in terms of age, race, and occupation. About one-tenth are under 20 years of age, nearly one-half are between 20 and 34, a little over two-tenths are between 35 and 44 and a little less than two-tenths are 45 and over.

Less than one-tenth of this group have resided in the Territory 10 years or less. Nearly nine-tenths have lived here 15 or more years. The bulk of our unemployed are island born.

Racially the Chinese, Japanese, and Part-Hawaiians are represented in the unemployed group in the same proportion in which they exist in our total population. The proportion of Filipinos among the unemployed is two and one-half times their proportion in the total population. This is at least partially due to the fact that there are three and one-half times as many men as there are women in this group. The proportion of Caucasians among the unemployed, on the other hand, is only half as great as their proportionate representation in the total population. This is undoubtedly due to the fact that there has been a marked outmigration of this group.

An examination of the occupational breakdown as developed by the Territorial employment service indicates over one-fifth to be classified as skilled workers and nearly one-fifth semiskilled. Only 15 percent are classified as unskilled whereas the clerical, sales and service groups represent 25 percent. Fourteen percent of the total consists of persons who are entering into employment for the first time. Only about 1 in 40 is represented by the professional and managerial group. Less than 1 in 50 registered as an agricultural worker. It does not seem logical, in an agricultural economy, that so few would be agricultural workers. It appears probable that many applicants indicate the occupation into which they wish to go (even though their experience in that field may be relatively meager) rather than the field in which they actually have the greater experience and proficiency. A detailed occupational breakdown based on experience has therefore been prepared by the Territorial employment service.

The current influences affecting the prospects of this group are as follows:

1. Factors tending toward a decrease in employment

(a) *Mechanization and increased man-hour output in industry.*—There can be no doubt that a part of the employment problem of Hawaii is technological. The mechanization programs, not only in the sugar and pineapple industries but in construction and many others fields throughout the Territory, have received a marked impetus since the end of the war. These changes are a result of the efforts of Hawaiian industries to meet competition. Judging from recent developments and the volume of recent investment in equipment, further declines in the number per unit of output appear likely.

(b) *The business cycle aspect of unemployment.*—During and since the war there has been a marked growth in the number of trade and service enterprises (such as florists, beauty parlors, filling stations, garages, radio shops, electrical appliance shops, music stores, etc.). The effect of the growth of unemployment is first felt in such enterprises. A decline of employment in these fields sets up a downward spiral in the sense that declining employment leads to less demand which in turn further decreases employment. We are already on the verge of this type of development, if we have not already entered into it.

(c) *A decrease in the number of self-employed.*—It appears probable that in the coming months there will be a decline in the number of small trade and service establishments. This is due not only to the overexpansion of the boom period of 1946-47 and to the downward trend (noted above) but also to the recent rapid development of large outlets (such as supermarkets) which tend to take the place of many small establishments. If this analysis is correct, the unemployed group will be increased by those who will cease to be self-employed.

(d) *The decline of consumer demand and of construction.*—In addition to the factors noted above, it appears probable that consumer demand and private construction will not remain on as high a level as the 1946-48 average. Figures are not yet available to determine the present level and trends because of the long water-front strike of 1949 and the natural revival to make up for the low levels during the strike. It is significant, however, that relatively few concerns have rehired as many employees as were laid off during the strike and that "unloads" of merchandise have been at less than previous levels during the first quarter of 1950.

(e) *High Federal and Territorial taxes.*—The Federal Government obtained \$90,824,694 in taxes from Hawaii in 1949. It is obvious that the extent to which tax rates increase or decrease has an important bearing on the position of Hawaiian enterprises and their capacity to maintain employment. Territorial taxes also are now relatively high.

2. Factors tending toward an increase in employment.

(a) *Expansion of the tourist industry.*—As of the present time the number of tourists in the Territory represents a near capacity load. The demand for space in the first-class hotels exceeds the supply. The 2-year million-dollar program of the HVB must be strongly slanted toward a building up of tourist business in the off season if we are to avoid overloads at the winter and summer peaks during the next few seasons. The general trend of the tourist business is upward and its effect is to increase employment.

(b) *New developments and the expansion of employment.*—It is inevitable that other areas of expansion (already discussed) will develop. The means are available and the economic pressures will force action. They require time, however, and promise little immediate employment.

3. Imponderables affecting employment

(a) *The military establishments and the volume of Federal employment of civilians in Hawaii.*—By far the largest and most uncertain factor affecting employment prospects in Hawaii is the policy of the Federal Government in respect to the military establishments here. In spite of the cut-backs in 1949, the Federal Government expended \$80,249,227 in pay to civilian employees of the armed services in Hawaii. It should be noted that in addition to the pay of civilians, the Government expended \$48,198,634 in pay to officers and enlisted men and provided \$7,002,534 in veterans' benefits. There are also over 2,000 employees of civilian agencies of the Federal Government in Hawaii representing a payroll of over \$9,000,000 annually. In addition to these items there are large expenditures for materials, supplies, and maintenance, amounting, in 1949, to \$29,521,315 which enters in the Hawaiian economy. The recent declines in Federal employment and expenditure constitute the most important immediate cause of unemployment.

(b) *Federal policies relative to the sugar industry.*—In a number of respects the policies of the Federal Government affect the sugar industry: (1) they determine the quota for Hawaii; (2) they determine the amount of the compliance payments to the plantations for producing sugar within the quota and in accordance with other Federal regulations; (3) by virtue of the international sugar agreement and of official policies relative to quotas and to Cuban sugar, the Federal Government exercises a long-range control over those factors which determine the price of sugar. Thus, the size, the profitability and, in the end, the total employment in the sugar industry is heavily dependent on policies of the Federal Government.

(c) *Other external factors affecting employment.*—On account of its high degree of specialization in sugar, pineapples, and services to the Armed Forces and tourists, Hawaii is extremely vulnerable to external factors which affect any one of these items. In addition to those already mentioned, there are, by way of illustration, transportation taxes, the rulings of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the plans of mainland concerns in respect to air and water transport or in respect to the use of Hawaiian products, shifts in mainland population and in its industrial structure, and even changes in policies of foreign countries (such as the revaluation of currencies in 1949).

Barring excessive outmigration, it does not appear probable that unemployment will greatly decline during the current year unless positive action is taken to bring about a change. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that an estimated 5,622 new workers will flow from our schools into the labor market this year. A marked decline in the size of the Military Establishment would, of course, heavily underscore this conclusion, whereas a marked increase would do much to bring the economy back in balance.

B. RISING RELIEF COSTS

The cost of welfare and relief programs in Hawaii has risen sharply in the wake of the rise in unemployment. Although it was assumed that the appropriations for this purpose that were made by the Territorial legislature in the spring of 1949 were sufficient to cover Territorial needs until the meeting of the legislature in 1951, it is already clear that the amount now available for this purpose is inadequate. The director of the Territorial department of public welfare indicated that, under the most favorable circumstances, the funds would hold out only until the end of the current year and that a deficit of approximately \$5,000,000 may be expected by the end of the fiscal year 1950-51.

The trend represents a twofold burden on the Territory in the sense that a decline in employment means less income taxes to the Territory where the rise in relief costs will require either an increase in taxes or further borrowing on the part of the Territorial government.

C. DECLINING FINANCIAL RESERVES

No figures are available to measure the over-all decrease in the financial reserves of the Territory that has occurred since 1946 or the flow of investments into or out of the Territory, but there is ample evidence of a marked decline.

D. OUT-MIGRATION

The rising pressure of unemployment has caused a considerable number of persons to leave the Territory. The estimates of the bureau of vital statistics indicate that the excess of departures over arrivals during the past year (1949) amounted to 23,836. Out-migration has continued in 1950.

E. OTHER NEGATIVE FACTORS

Additional effects of the lack of economic balance in Hawaii are to be found in a decline in real estate values and in the value of Hawaiian securities.

F. POSITIVE FACTORS

In contrast to these negative factors, it should be noted that the total volume of business remained on comparatively high levels well into 1950 and that the total volume of financial reserves in Hawaii, in spite of the declines since 1946, is still on a far higher level than they were before the war. The basic sugar and pineapple industries which had sunk to lower-than-normal levels of production during the war and which were weakened by serious strikes following the war have now returned to prewar levels of production and there appear to be somewhat more stable labor-management relationships (that is, there appears to be little likelihood of a recurrence in the future of the long devastating strikes that occurred during the period 1946-49).

The primary economic problem of Hawaii is not that existing industries have declined. On the contrary, they have recovered from wartime lows to prewar levels of output. But prewar levels of production are now insufficient because of the extraordinary increase in population since 1940. The decline in the total Federal expenditure in Hawaii has resulted in a shrinkage in the size of the economy and the volume of employment here, thus leaving a large element of the population outside of the present area of economic activity. The problem is to offset this decline in our income of mainland dollars (1) by an increase in the number of mainland dollars derived from a larger tourist trade and from the expansion of exports, and (2) by decreasing our expenditures on the mainland by the production in Hawaii of more of the food we have been importing.

V. A 1950 ACTION PROGRAM

The purpose of this section is to suggest measures for providing emergency employment and to indicate promising areas for long-range economic expansion.

A. AN EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The Territory has recognized the necessity for action to deal with unemployment by the creation of a full employment committee on December 1, 1949.

To date the efforts of this committee have focused on (1) arrangements with the Federal Government to obtain employment outside of Hawaii (in Guam, Eniwetok, Okinawa, and other "forward areas"), (2) implementation of President Truman's "E area program"⁶ (an effort to obtain action on a formula

⁶ The term "E Area" refers to areas of the United States requiring aid because they face difficult postwar readjustment. The evidence of this need is the percentage of unemployment as reported by the U. S. Department of Labor. For this purpose Oahu and Maui have been declared "E Areas." The President's plan to assist such areas consisted in diverting the purchases of military supplies for the armed forces to such areas. This formula does not fit Hawaii, however, since such supplies are not manufactured here. Hence urgent representations have been made by the full-employment committee and the chamber of commerce for action on a formula that does fit Hawaii; that is, (1) no further cutbacks in the size of the military establishment or in the number of civilian employees here, (2) an increase in the volume of ship repair in Pearl Harbor, (3) the "moth-balling" in Hawaii of ships not in service, and (4) the use of the Hawaiian area as a base for "war games."

which would fit Hawaii), (3) action to obtain a Civilian Conservation Corps program for Hawaii, and (4) a local program to promote employment consisting of a renovation, clean-up, paint-up, repair and remodeling campaign. Although new jobs have been created, the total accomplishment has been small as measured against the job of achieving full employment.

Additional action which promises some increase in employment is a review of authorized public works (Territorial, county, and Federal) for which funds have been voted and with the idea of speeding up action to increase employment.

All of these actions represent only a beginning in the attack on unemployment, however. A much larger program is required if realistic solutions are to be found. This should take the form of (1) community action, (2) Territorial action, and (3) Federal action.

1. A community program

Action by the community to provide emergency employment has certain advantages. It creates unity and self-reliance and can be undertaken promptly by organized groups that are in touch with employment needs. The most significant action that has been taken is the creation of a fund (approximately a million dollars over a 2-year period) for the rapid expansion of the tourist business in Hawaii. This has both immediate and long-range implications, as will be noted later. In addition to the measures already taken by the committee it may be possible for the community to expand employment by a better organization of the many local handicraft industries, or a better organization of employment in domestic service.

2. A Territorial program

The Territory is already sustaining a large public works program. The first step in formulating a Territorial program is, therefore, to determine the extent to which the Territory can support additional public works.⁷ On the basis of such determination, additional public works which lie within the capacity of the Territory can be undertaken. In determining the projects that should be undertaken, first priority should be given to those that will add to the productive resources of the Territory and thus create a permanently higher level of employment (projects concerned with water conservation, irrigation, and reclamation).

3. A Federal program

The formulation of a proposed Federal public works program has been undertaken by a small group established by the full employment committee so that it will be ready when needed. The time and effort required for this work will be considerable but is very small in comparison to the social and economic cost to the Territory of the failure to have such a program in hand when it is needed.

For effective presentation to the proper Federal authorities, such a program will include (1) a factual statement covering unemployment in the Territory—present position and trends—accompanied by a clearly worded analysis of the causes, with special reference to the effects of the war and the postwar policies of the Federal Government here; (2) a review of the efforts that have been and are being made here to deal with unemployment; (3) an evaluation of the additional volume of employment that is required to meet the problem; (4) a suggested list of proposed Federal public works by projects, covering cost, volume of employment, skills required, duration of employment, added productivity and permanent employment resulting from the project, and (5) estimated increase in the taxpaying power resulting from the added productivity.⁸

⁷ In an effort to deal with rising unemployment the Territorial government sharply increased its public works expenditures throughout 1948-49. Since January 1949, the average monthly rate of Territorial expenditure for this purpose has been nearly 5 times the level of 1946 and 14 times the level of the last prewar year. The figures are—

July 1, 1939, to June 30, 1940	\$761,701
July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941	910,539
July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1946	2,407,640
July 1, 1946, to June 30, 1947	3,271,367
July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	4,950,339
July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949	13,661,166

Figures for the war years are on a "cost plus" basis but averaged about two to three millions annually. Figures for 1949-50 have been maintained on the same average level as for 1948-49.

⁸ The increase in Federal and Territorial taxes and the decrease in the incomes on which those taxes must depend means that the economic effects of further increases in taxes must be carefully considered. It is obvious that the capacity of private enterprises to increase employment and the inducement to establish new enterprises in Hawaii will be weakened by higher tax rates. This must be balanced against any advantage accruing from additional public works based on Territorial taxes.

This will be followed by a statement covering the costs (unemployment and relief) that will be incurred if such a Federal works program is not undertaken.

Here again, careful attention will be given to projects which will increase the basic resources and productive capacity of the Territory.

The basis for these action programs—organized information

The need for information should not prevent immediate action on desirable measures for increasing employment. Unemployment has reached critical levels and vigorous action is urgent. In the end, however, the various measures that are adopted must be related to one another in an over-all program of the size and character that will fit our employment needs. The key to the formulation of such a program is information based on organized staff work.

For the purposes of formulating an effective employment program data and analyses covering the following items are being assembled:

1. The present employment position of Hawaii—labor force, unemployment, and relief data—present position and prospects.
2. The present public works programs for 1950-51—prospective volume of expenditure and volume of employment as compared to previous years.
3. Capacity of the Territory to support additional public works projects—Territorial tax trends as related to income trends in Hawaii—the debt position of the Territory—comparison between the Territorial tax and debt position and that of States and the Federal Government.
4. A review of the basic land and water resources of the Territory to determine the projects required to increase our permanent productive capacity—a selected list and data on the most desirable of these projects.

B. LONG-RANGE DEVELOPMENT

The emergency employment program is not in any sense a final solution for the problems we face. It is designed to provide jobs until the expansion of the economy creates full employment in permanent productive enterprises.

There are only four ways in which the economy of Hawaii can be brought back into a balance. These are (1) a decrease in population, (2) increased efficiency and economy in the use of goods we import, (3) an increase in local production of items that we have been importing from the mainland (in particular vegetable, meat, dairy, and poultry products), and (4) an expansion of our export industries. The economic pressures developing here are already forcing action in these directions.

1. Decrease in population

There has been a marked exodus of Hawaiian residents during the past year. In spite of the fact that the excess of births over deaths currently amounts to over 900 persons per month, the population of the Territory declined from 541,000 in March 1949 to 527,000 January 1, 1950. This exodus has the advantage of reducing unemployment and of reducing the volume of mainland consumer goods required in Hawaii. It has certain adverse effects, however. To the extent that departing residents take funds with them, there is a decline in the financial reserves of the Territory. A decline in population decreases the potential customers of Hawaiian trade and service industries and leads to reduction in real-estate values. To the extent that those leaving the islands are especially trained or able persons, there is a decrease in the human reserves of energy, initiative, and capacity for expanding Hawaiian industry.

Decisions to migrate are individual decisions freely made. But by initiating action to provide transportation (by the Territory, by the Federal Government, or by responsible concerns) for those who would presumably become a burden on the community, the volume of unemployment here can be reduced.

2. Efficiency and economy

During the lush days of the war and the postwar boom, inefficient practices developed throughout the economy (particularly in small trade and service enterprises). At a time when demand far exceeded supply and the primary problem was to serve as many customers as possible, it is understandable that careful attention to inventories and to operating ratios should have been neglected. But the rapid expansion in the number of trade and service concerns, followed by a decline of demand and employment, has led to such a sharp competitive situation that, as a matter of self-preservation, such concerns throughout the Territory are now being forced to adopt economies and more efficient methods of operation. Positive action can make this trend more effective. For example,

the small business bureau of the United States Department of Commerce provides a series of pamphlets on improving operating efficiency of business, including not only general pamphlets on inventory practices, financing, and on operating ratios, but also specific bulletins on how to run a grocery, hardware store, florist shop, drugstore, etc. It also provides a well developed program for a short course to managers of retail and service establishments.

This is only one of many ways in which increased efficiency would aid in balancing our economy. A careful review of all items of expenditure for mainland goods and services will reveal those points at which economies can be effected.

3. Local production for local consumption of items we are importing from the mainland

The expansion of truck gardening in Hawaii is dependent not only on production costs but also on cooperation among producers, in respect to production schedules, transportation, and marketing practices. To meet more of our local requirement for food, a greater local production of low-cost animal feed is required so that our output of milk and dairy products, eggs, poultry, and meats can be expanded. The technical and practical feasibility of a basic development of an Hawaiian stock feed as a byproduct of the sugar industry to take the place of the more expensive mainland feeds has been demonstrated.

During the time that the process for producing stock feed is being perfected, every effort should be made to increase efficiency in the practices of poultry, dairy, swine, and beef producers. There is a lack of efficiency in this field. Animals and fowl that represent losses to the producer are not eliminated. The Agricultural Extension Service is now undertaking a strong drive in this direction.

Many of the edibles imported from the Far East (lichees, mushrooms, and frog legs, for example) can be produced here.

4. Expansion of exports

The most immediate prospect for increasing our income in mainland dollars is the expansion of the volume of Hawaiian goods and services sold to tourists here. This is already evident in an expanding tourist trade. A healthy future development requires (1) persistent effort for continuous expansion by the community through the Hawaii Visitors Bureau and other agencies, (2) farsighted planning toward ultimate objectives, and (3) the gradual parallel expansion of tourist facilities to match the growth of tourist trade—these developments to be guided by the over-all plans.

From a long-range point of view other important areas of expansion of exports appear to be (1) development of cellulose as a byproduct of the sugar industry, (2) the further expansion of the pineapple industry, and (3) the expansion of the export of agricultural products, including flowers and foliage, macadamia nuts, papaya, mangoes, and guava. There is a possibility of developing winter vegetables for export during the mainland off-season. Proposals for expansion of canned tuna and for the development of other marine products are still in the research and experimental stage.⁹

C. CONCLUSION

This quick review of the various possibilities for bringing the economy of Hawaii into balance indicates that many of these developments will occur in time by virtue of competition and force of developing economic pressures. The ultimate solution of our employment problem is long-range economic development to expand the total productive output based on venture capital and the initiative of business enterprise in Hawaii.

The means for bringing the economy into balance are clearly available. By taking positive action now much of the distress of postwar economic readjustment that we now face can be avoided.

The present economic problems of Hawaii are not unique. On the contrary, they are similar to the problems confronting the United States as a whole. The inflationary effects of the war are now largely dissipated and the Nation faces the problem of balancing its budget and readjustment to long-range postwar conditions. The Committee for Economic Development is playing a leading role in this work. Every State has been affected by the economic impact of World War II. Many of them have adopted specific area-development programs.

⁹ The Department of the Interior has established a research station in Hawaii for this purpose. The University of Hawaii is participating in this work.

As an integral part of the American economy, Hawaii must participate in this process. Postwar readjustment here will be decidedly more difficult than it will be for most mainland areas because Hawaii was a focal point of wartime activity. The impact of the war on the relatively small economy of the Territory greatly intensified the imbalance between our total population and our basic productive output. This fact was obscured not only by the immediate effects of the war itself but by the inflationary forces which were released when wartime restrictions were lifted. Thus the effects of the lack of balance were not felt here until 1948.

The problems we face have been intensified by a broad postwar shift in labor-management relations, accompanied by a series of strikes. For this reason, there has been a tendency for the community to divide into opposing groups, one insisting that "management is to blame" and the other that "labor unions are to blame" for our economic ills. Possibly mistakes have been made on both sides and the strikes have been costly to the economy of Hawaii, but they cannot be considered the basic cause of our present economic problem. Economic disruptions and maladjustments are an inevitable cost of war. We are today paying a part of the price. In any case, such a division in the community is a luxury we cannot now afford.

As a practical matter, individuals and groups are activated by self-interest in economic affairs. But self-interest that is not intelligent destroys the very thing it seeks. In the situation we now face, the self-interest of all groups in Hawaii requires unity of action on a reasonable program of postwar readjustment because all groups will gain by joint action. The ultimate objective of such a program is an expansion of the productive capacity of Hawaii designed to bring into a balance (1) manpower and jobs and (2) income from, and payments to, the mainland.

If the program is successful—

- (1) Labor will gain stability of wages and employment.
- (2) Management will gain an expansion of productivity and a general increase in business activity, based on full employment.
- (3) The Territory will gain economic and political stability, based on unity of action and a balanced economy.

The key to a successful program is—

- (1) A Territory-wide understanding of the situation we face.
- (2) Policies that are not slanted for or against any group in the community but designed to broaden and strengthen the economy as a whole.
- (3) Programs that make full use of resources to meet needs, based on a knowledge of all pertinent facts.
- (4) Vigorous action supported by agreement and confidence in the program.

This report on Hawaii's economic position would not have been possible without the cooperation of many individuals, business firms and governmental organizations.

This is particularly true in regard to the vital statement on the balance of payments between Hawaii and the mainland. Much of the information necessary for this statement had never before been compiled.

As a result, it was necessary for members of the department of business research at the Bank of Hawaii to gather much of this information directly from many business firms in the Territory.

To these companies, many of whom made available confidential business information, as well as to all other organizations and individuals who cooperated with the Bank of Hawaii in this study, our thanks for their cooperation and confidence.

J. H. S.

A SUMMARY REVIEW OF THE ECONOMY OF HAWAII TODAY

A BRIEF STUDY OF THE ECONOMY OF HAWAII WITH ESTIMATES OF INCOME AND EXPENDITURES AND A REVIEW OF MEASURES NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE POSTWAR READJUSTMENT

(Prepared by James H. Shoemaker, vice president, Bank of Hawaii and director of department of business research)

In October of last year we announced the development of a research department under the direction of James H. Shoemaker. We promised at that time to make available to the people of Hawaii the results of the studies of this new department.

This booklet is a summary of the first report on the economy of Hawaii. Certainly it does not disclose a favorable position for the Territory. But it is the truth insofar as we have been able to discover it. And we believe, in presenting this report, that the people of Hawaii want the truth, for it is only on the basis of facts that constructive programs can be developed to improve the basic conditions that affect all of us.

We have no intention of stopping our studies with this report. We intend to go on with a sincere determination to point the way to sound corrective measures to assure a reversal of the unfavorable trends that have caused our present condition.

Our economic position, while unfavorable, is not yet dangerous. But it can be if we don't do something about it. Nature has given Hawaii tremendous resources. It is our job to use them to provide all of us a fuller opportunity.

To strengthen Hawaii's economy is the job of every organization, every unit of government, every single individual whose stake is here in Hawaii.

We at the Bank of Hawaii intend to help in every practical way we can.

E. W. CARDEN,
President, Bank of Hawaii.

MAY 1, 1950.

Everyone knows that the war brought many changes in the life of Hawaii. But what these changes are—and how deep they run—is still being revealed as Hawaii ends its postwar boom and faces the job of once again building a normal economy and way of life.

About us are many surface signs of the problems we face. Nearly 30,000 people are unemployed. Relief costs are placing a heavy load on the Territorial government. Twenty-four thousand persons left the Territory in 1949. It is clear that we are in a critical period of economic readjustment.

To analyze these changing economic conditions and help work toward a sound solution of our economic problems, the Bank of Hawaii established a department of business research in December of 1949.

Some of the preliminary studies have been reported in talks to various organizations throughout the Territory and in conferences with governmental and other groups.

The first report, including an analysis of our balance of payments with the mainland, has just been completed.

In keeping with the Bank of Hawaii's policy of making these services available to the people of Hawaii, this study, the *Economy of Hawaii Today*, is being released in both detailed and summary form.

Below the surface signs of unemployment and mounting relief, the study reveals that Hawaii is spending more than it is earning in mainland dollars, upon which our highly specialized economy depends.

It also makes clear that prompt action is necessary to balance our economy with the mainland in terms of dollars; within Hawaii, in terms of jobs and people.

Suggested programs of action are briefly outlined.

This report will be followed from time to time by a more detailed description and analysis of measures which can be taken to expand production and unemployment in the Territory.

HAWAII AND THE MAINLAND

Once, the mainland meant nothing to Hawaii in terms of things needed for everyday life. Today, it means almost everything.

In the process of becoming a modern American community, Hawaii has changed from a simple, diversified, self-sufficient economy to a modern, highly specialized economy, tightly geared to mainland markets.

Today, more than \$9 out of every \$10 we spend to equip our industries, buy supplies, and maintain our modern standard of living, are spent on the mainland.

As a result, obtaining mainland dollars to spend for things we need from the mainland is everybody's business in Hawaii today.

Directly or indirectly, everyone in Hawaii depends upon mainland dollars for most of the things he wants.

To obtain these mainland dollars to buy the things we need, Hawaii sells:

(1) Sugar—based on scientific mass production methods, on mainland refining and marketing arrangements established by the Hawaiian sugar industry, and on a quota system established by the Federal Government.

(2) Pineapples—based on equally efficient mass production and marketing methods.

(3) Services—things that people living in Hawaii do for the Armed Forces, tourists, steamship companies, airlines, and other concerns from the mainland. In 1949 these services provided the greatest single source of mainland dollars.

These three items represent over 95 percent of the power of Hawaii to buy mainland products.

Or in other words, most of the money we earn to pay for mainland products—more than 95 out of every 100 dollars—comes from selling pineapple and sugar or doing things for the Federal Government, tourists, or mainland businesses operating in Hawaii.

The rest of the money comes from other exports (primarily flowers, coffee, fiberboard and canned fish) and Hawaiian investments on the mainland.

In short, we have specialized in raising sugar and pineapple and in providing services for others from the mainland.

At the same time, we cannot produce most of the things we need and want for modern living—supplies and equipment for our plantations, newsprint for our newspapers, or the modern cars, radios, and appliances in our homes. Even two-thirds of the food we eat is imported.

The result is that our standard of living in Hawaii—the things we have and the way we live—depends directly upon the total volume of mainland dollars we can earn together.

But just as a family cannot spend more than it earns without getting into trouble, Hawaii cannot spend more mainland dollars than all its people earn together without getting into trouble.

There come times when communities as well as families have to start keeping books on how much they are earning and spending.

That time has come for Hawaii. There are many signs that tell us it is time to look at the books on our trade with the mainland.

This is just what we have done. With the help of many businesses and individuals, the research department of the Bank of Hawaii has added up the mainland dollars Hawaii earned and spent during 1949.

MAINLAND DOLLARS—EARNED AND SPENT, 1949

The following balance of payments statement is an estimate of how Hawaii earned and spent mainland dollars during 1949. It is not an exact accounting because exact records were not kept by everyone on each item. In such cases, estimates have been made as closely as possible. Such a statement cannot be as accurate as a bank statement or an accountant's balance sheet for a business. But it is as accurate a statement as can be developed now. Because no balance of payments statement has ever been drawn for the Territory, there are no previous figures with which these can be compared.

But even though the account may not be exact, the difference between the mainland dollars earned and those spent by Hawaii during 1949 leaves no doubt on the main point—Hawaii spent more mainland dollars than we earned in 1949. Further proof of this is to be found in the present economic conditions throughout the Territory.

Balance of payments between Hawaii and the mainland, 1949

In 1949, we earned mainland dollars in the following manner:

INCOME

1. We sold goods and services in Hawaii for mainland dollars, amounting to_____	\$205,343,000
(a) To the Federal Government (the armed forces and the civilian agencies) we sold goods and services amounting to_____	174,926,000
(b) To tourists we sold goods and services amounting to approximately_____	25,000,000
(c) To shipping and air lines and to other mainland concerns in Hawaii we sold goods and services amounting to_____	5,417,000

Balance of payments between Hawaii and the mainland, 1949—Continued

INCOME—continued

2. We exported Hawaiian products for mainland dollars, amounting to-----	\$212, 466, 000
(a) Our gross income from the sale of sugar and pineapples amounted to-----	205, 520, 000
(b) The aggregate value of our export of coffee, canned fish, wallboard, and flowers and foliage amounted to-----	5, 091, 000
(c) The export of macadamia nuts, papaya, lauhala ware, woodenware, curios, etc., brought us approximately--	1, 855, 000
3. We obtained a total additional income in mainland dollars (including returns on Hawaiian capital invested on the mainland or abroad, and numerous other minor forms of income) of about-----	10, 905, 000
Thus our total income in mainland dollars was-----	428, 714, 000

In 1949 we spent our money for the following purposes:

EXPENDITURES

1. We bought goods amounting to-----	\$324, 786, 000
(a) From the mainland we purchased food, clothing, shoes, motorcars, plantation equipment, fertilizers, public-utility equipment, fuel, gasoline, electrical supplies, medical supplies, and many other items, amounting to--	307, 612, 000
(b) From foreign countries we bought goods amounting to--	17, 174, 000
2. For the services of mainland and foreign concerns, we paid----	58, 026, 000
(a) The largest expenditure for service was for ocean freight, amounting to-----	28, 737, 000
(b) The second largest item was for transportation and other services to Hawaiian residents while outside of the Territory, amounting to ¹ -----	16, 681, 000
(c) Other services, including insurance (net cost), mainland advertising, motion pictures, etc., amounting to--	12, 608, 000
3. We made payments to the Federal Government, amounting to--	93, 670, 000
(a) We paid in Federal taxes-----	90, 824, 000
(b) Postal services cost us-----	2, 846, 000
4. We paid in interest, dividends, and profits to mainland or foreign concerns with investments in Hawaii approximately-----	10, 135, 000
5. Payments of dues, fees, and gift remittances to families on the mainland, in Japan, Korea, the Philippines, and elsewhere, amounted to-----	6, 819, 000
6. Nearly 24,000 persons left Hawaii in 1949 and took with them approximately ² -----	11, 300, 000
Thus our total expenditures in 1949 amounted to-----	504, 736, 000
Since our total income was only-----	428, 714, 000

We spent more mainland dollars than we earned in 1949, in the amount of----- 76, 022, 000

¹ About \$4,400,000 for return of residents to the mainland. Not a recurring item.

² Not a normally recurring item but out-migration is continuing at a high level in 1950.

WHERE WE ARE TODAY—AND WHY

Our balance of payments for Hawaii in 1949 shows that we spent about 76,000,-000 more mainland dollars than we earned last year. The indications are that we are continuing to spend more mainland dollars than we are earning.

To understand why, we have to look at what has happened in the past. Up until the 1930's—about 20 years ago—Hawaii's basic industries, principally pine-

apple and sugar, grew as fast as the population increased. The things we produced and sold on the mainland continued to bring us enough mainland dollars to buy the things we needed.

But beginning in the 1930's, as our population continued to grow, we began to have to depend upon income from other things—such as services to tourists and the Federal Government—to give us the additional mainland dollars needed to supply our rapidly growing population.

Government spending just before, during, and immediately after the war brought these mainland dollars. It also brought many more people.

In fact, today there are 132,000 more people in Hawaii than were here in 1940, just 10 years ago.¹

But since the war ended, we have returned to about the same economic and industrial base which provided the mainland dollars for our smaller population before the war began. Production of pineapple and sugar is about the same as before the war, but the volume of our services to the armed forces and other government operations has been dropping back toward prewar proportions.

The result is that today our population is larger, we have more people, than can be supported at our present standard of living by the goods we produce and the services we sell for mainland dollars.

This simply means that the sugar, pineapple, and other goods we sell, plus the services we provide tourists, the government, and others are not now bringing us enough mainland dollars to let everyone live the same way he's been used to living during the past 10 or 12 years.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Here then is the heart of our problem today. Our population has outgrown the size of our economic and industrial base.

We have 132,000 more people in Hawaii than in 1940. At the same time, the principal things that bring us our mainland dollars are returning to 1940 proportions. This is a period of economic readjustment.

This combination of circumstances has affected Hawaii in two ways. First, it has resulted in our spending more mainland dollars than we earned in 1949. Second, it has resulted in a lack of jobs to provide full employment for our total labor force.

People, jobs and mainland dollars are out of balance.

If we do not get things back into balance—if we continue to spend more mainland dollars than we earn—

- (a) Wages and standards of living will fall.
- (b) Unemployment will continue to be critical because there won't be enough productive work in the Territory to provide jobs for all our labor force.
- (c) Our financial reserves in Hawaii will decrease.
- (d) Relief costs will remain high or rise still higher.

Obviously, no one wants to see any of these four things happen.

The only way to prevent them from happening is to bring Hawaii's economy back into balance—to bring a balance between mainland dollars spent and earned and a balance between jobs and the labor force.

There are only four ways in which the economy of Hawaii can be brought back into balance. These are:

(1) Decrease in population—About 24,000 people left the islands in 1949. This out-migration is continuing in 1950 at about the same rate. Such decisions are made by the individuals. Some jobs may be found in other areas for our unemployed. But while this reduces unemployment and amount of mainland goods required, it may also have unwelcome effects by taking out money and productive people and reducing local business and real estate values.

(2) Increase efficiency and economy in use of imported goods. During the lush days of the war and postwar boom, inefficient practices developed in Hawaii, particularly in trade and service industries. There are many ways we can increase our efficiency in business and cut down waste both in business and in private living.

(3) Increase local production of items we have been importing from the mainland—particularly vegetables, meat, dairy and poultry products, and building materials.

¹ Figures as of January 1, 1950, based on estimates of the Territorial bureau of vital statistics. Because of chaotic war conditions we lost the bench mark of the 1940 census. Hence, this estimate is not as dependable as it normally would be. The 1950 census, nearing completion, may require a considerable revision of these figures.

(4) Increase our income of mainland dollars—the most immediate opportunity for increasing our income of mainland dollars lies in increasing our tourist trade.

From the long range point of view, important fields for expansion appear to be:

- (a) Development of byproducts of our basic industries.
- (b) Further expansion of pineapple production.
- (c) Further development of typical Hawaiian agricultural products for export, including flowers and foliage, macadamia nuts, papaya and other tropical fruits as well as marine products.

All this adds up to one conclusion. The means for bringing the economy of Hawaii into balance are clearly available. We can earn as many mainland dollars as we spend and balance people and jobs.

A LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Balancing mainland dollars earned and spent, and also balancing jobs and people, call for a long range development program designed to.

- (1) Expand the water and land resources of the Territory.
- (2) Develop byproducts of our basic industries and expand them if possible.
- (3) Increase tourist trade.
- (4) Stimulate local production of foods we have been importing from the mainland.
- (5) Expand other exports.
- (6) Develop new exports.

These things can be done. But they will take time, work, faith, business initiative and men who are willing to risk money—venture capital—to make profits and jobs, which go together.

This, however, will not solve our immediate problem. As of March 1950, 29,885 people were unemployed in Hawaii. We also need an emergency employment program to provide jobs and buying power until our long range program of basic industrial expansion has been carried out.

AN EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

An emergency employment program can do two basic things—can kill two birds with one stone. First, it can supply jobs. Second, if properly planned, those jobs can help step up the long range development of Hawaii. Such a program should consist of:

- (1) Community action to stimulate tourist trade and make needed local improvements.
- (2) Territorial action to improve highways, develop school facilities and other public works to employ idle manpower to improve the Territory as a place to live and as a tourist center, as well as to help increase production of local industry.
- (3) Federal action on projects for water conservation, irrigation, and reclamation to increase the productive output and permanent jobs in the Territory.

The communities of Hawaii have recognized the necessity for positive measures. All islands in the Territory are cooperating in a strongly supported program for expanding tourists trade. The results of this effort are already evident. The various chambers of commerce in the Territory have organized committees to formulate and carry forward plans for economic development. Community programs are being developed to provide emergency employment.

The Territorial government recognized the necessity for action by creating the full employment committee on December 1, 1949. This committee has opened avenues of employment for Hawaiian workers in forward areas in the Pacific, and is working toward specific measures (such as a Civilian Conservation Corps) for the immediate expansion of employment in the Territory. It also has initiated staff work on research and planning as a basis for sound Territorial and Federal programs designed to fit the present needs of Hawaii.

The Federal Government has recognized the critical economic conditions in the Territory by classifying Hawaii as an "E area." Within the limits of their available resources, the commanding officers of the armed services of Hawaii have co-operated to soften the effects of the Federal cutbacks in civilian employment (which have been a primary cause of unemployment).

These efforts, however, represent only a beginning of the job that must be done.

CONCLUSIONS

Hawaii's books are out of balance on its mainland account. We are spending more mainland dollars than we are earning. At the same time nearly 30,000 people are unemployed.

This is because we have 132,000 more people here in Hawaii than in 1940—but our industrial and economic base, by which we earn mainland dollars, is returning to 1940 proportions.

By economy at home and long-range development of our own industries and services, we can earn as many mainland dollars as we spend and put Hawaii on a sound basis. But that will take time. Meantime, an emergency employment program is needed.

We can be successful in both fields—long-range development and emergency employment—if we have—

(1) Territory-wide understanding of the situation we face. That means everyone.

(2) Policies that are not slanted for or against any group in the community but designed to broaden and strengthen the economy as a whole.

(3) Programs that make full use of all our resources to meet our needs, based on a knowledge of the facts.

(4) Vigorous action supported by public agreement and confidence in these programs.

From the successful application of these programs, everyone has something to gain—in production, employment, wages and profits, as well as the human values of living in a stable economy of productively employed people.

It is for the purpose of focusing attention upon these problems and the means by which they may be solved that this survey has been made and is now released to the people of the Territory by the Bank of Hawaii.

MR. FARRINGTON. Now, Senator, you asked for the population of the Territories when they were admitted to the Union as States. That is taken from an old hearing on statehood. I do not know whether you want that in the record or not, but it is available to you.

MR. McLANE. That is from the 1946 hearing, Senator.

THE CHAIRMAN. We will make it a part of the record.

(The table referred to is as follows:)

EXHIBIT 3A. PRESENTED BY HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION ¹

Territory	Date of organic act	Date admitted as State	Population at date of organic act	Racial classification and total population at date of admission as State			Value at date of admission as State ⁴			
				Negroes	Whites	Indians ² and Orientals ³	Total	Real property ⁵	Raw materials	Goods produced
Ohio.....	1797	1803	—	337	45,028	—	45,365	—	—	—
Tennessee.....	1790	1796	35,691	13,893	91,709	—	105,602	—	—	—
Mississippi.....	1798	1817	8,850	33,272	42,176	—	75,448	—	—	—
Indiana.....	1800	1816	5,641	1,430	145,758	—	147,178	—	—	—
Louisiana.....	1804	1812	76,556	42,245	34,311	—	76,556	—	—	—
Michigan.....	1805	1837	4,762	20,707	211,860	—	212,267	—	—	—
Missouri.....	1805	1821	20,845	10,569	56,017	—	66,586	—	—	—
Illinois.....	1809	1818	12,282	1,374	53,857	—	55,211	—	—	—
Alabama.....	1817	1819	—	42,450	85,451	—	127,901	—	—	—
Arkansas.....	1819	1836	—	20,400	85,451	—	97,574	—	—	—
Florida.....	1822	1845	—	40,242	77,174	—	117,416	—	—	—
Wisconsin.....	1826	1846	30,945	635	304,756	—	305,391	—	—	—
Iowa.....	1838	1846	43,112	333	191,881	—	192,214	—	—	—
Oregon.....	1848	1859	13,294	128	52,160	—	52,288	—	—	—
Minnesota.....	1849	1858	6,077	259	169,395	—	169,654	—	—	—
New Mexico.....	1850	1912	61,547	1,628	304,594	21,078	327,300	—	—	—
Utah.....	1850	1896	11,383	672	272,465	3,612	276,749	—	—	—
Washington.....	1853	1889	11,198	1,602	340,829	11,181	353,612	—	—	—
Nebraska.....	1854	1867	28,841	789	122,117	—	122,906	—	—	—
Kansas.....	1854	1861	—	627	106,390	—	107,017	—	—	—
Colorado.....	1861	1876	34,277	2,435	191,126	—	193,561	—	—	—
Nevada.....	1861	1864	6,857	45	6,812	—	6,857	—	—	—
North Dakota.....	1861	1889	2,977	373	182,407	8,174	190,954	—	—	—
South Dakota.....	1861	1889	2,977	541	328,010	13,864	345,405	—	—	—
Arizona.....	1863	1912	9,658	2,009	171,498	30,877	204,384	—	—	—
Idaho.....	1863	1890	—	201	82,117	86,541	86,541	—	—	—
Montana.....	1864	1889	20,595	1,488	117,000	11,206	129,794	—	—	—
Wyoming.....	1868	1890	9,118	1,922	59,753	1,844	62,549	—	—	—
Oklahoma.....	1890	1907	61,864	137,612	1,444,531	74,825	1,656,968	—	—	—
Hawaii ⁶	1900	—	154,001	—	—	—	502,122	—	—	—

¹ Statehood for Hawaii, hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Territories, House of Representatives, 79th Cong., 2d sess., pursuant to H. Res. 236 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1946), pp. 656-657.

² No census of Indian population by State available prior to 1890.

³ Orientals: New Mexico, 506; Utah, 989; Arizona, 1,676.

⁴ Figures for the population, assessed valuation of real property, and production taken from the census nearest the date of admission as a State.

⁵ No figures available for the assessed value of real property or value of products prior to 1850.

⁶ Data on Hawaii: Population, board of health estimate for 1945; assessed value of real property for 1945; coffee (1945 figure). For racial classification in Hawaii, see exhibit 2. Goods produced include sugar (1945 figure), pineapple (1941 figure), coffee (1945 figure).

Sources of data on other Territories: Carter's Territorial Papers, vol. 1; Census reports; Compendium of the Enumeration of the Inhabitants and Statistics of the United States, 1840; organic acts in the Statutes at Large, U. S.: J. D. B. DeBow, Industrial Resources, etc., of the Southern and Western States; Samuel Hallett; Industrial and Financial Resources of the United States of America.

Mr. FARRINGTON. The Hawaii Statehood Commission reports that the president of the board of agriculture and forestry, Mr. Collin G. Lennox, has prepared these maps [pointing] showing the distribution of lands in different categories and we will be glad to make those available to the committee.

(The large maps referred to were placed on file with the committee.)

Mr. FARRINGTON. We also have the charts covering the population of the Territory and the internal revenue collections, and we will be glad also to make that part of the files.

The CHAIRMAN. Those facts will be inserted in the record, and we will keep the charts for our files.

(The charts referred to are as follows:)

HAWAII COMPARED TO 13 STATES

Thirteen States now have one or two Representatives and two Senators in the United States Congress. Hawaii would be the fourteenth State in this category.

State	Representatives	Population ¹	State	Representatives	Population ¹
Arizona.....	2	664,000	North Dakota.....	2	560,000
Delaware ²	1	297,000	Rhode Island.....	2	748,000
Idaho ²	2	530,000	South Dakota.....	2	623,000
Montana ²	2	511,000	Utah.....	2	655,000
Nevada ²	1	142,000	Vermont ²	1	374,000
New Hampshire.....	2	548,000	Wyoming ²	1	275,000
New Mexico.....	2	571,000	Hawaii.....	2	³ 533,000

¹ Population: Estimates from U. S. Bureau of Census, July 1, 1948.

² States exceeded in population by Hawaii.

³ Hawaii's population on July 1, 1949, was estimated to be 530,891 by the Territorial Board of Health.

Federal internal revenue collections Calendar year 1949

Hawaii.....	\$84,330,718.47	North Dakota.....	\$61,927,228.16
Montana.....	80,703,064.82	New Mexico.....	57,097,900.58
Arizona.....	79,843,228.96	Wyoming.....	40,408,863.04
Idaho.....	76,833,904.86	Vermont.....	37,791,068.01
New Hampshire.....	68,174,337.03	Nevada.....	37,750,906.67
South Dakota.....	65,403,297.82		

Mr. FARRINGTON. You requested a summary of Federal grants-in-aid to Hawaii. The statehood commission has prepared this data. I would like to submit that for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir.

(The summary referred to is as follows:)

FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID TO HAWAII

Hawaii's organic act (48 U. S. C. A. 495) provides "That the Constitution, and, except as otherwise provided, all the laws of the United States, including laws carrying general appropriations, which are not locally inapplicable, shall have the same force and effect within the said Territory as elsewhere in the United States * * *"

Hawaii is included in the expenditures made by the Government as direct payments to States under cooperative arrangements and expenditures within States which provided relief and other aid.

The following table lists the Federal grants-in-aid made to Hawaii during the fiscal year 1949. The word "none" is shown in the amount column when the program provided for has no application in Hawaii.

NOTE.—On the basis of 1948 United States census estimates, the per capita Federal grants-in-aid to Hawaii for 1949 amounted to \$42.56. Per capita grants to certain other States were as follows: Arizona, \$45.96; California, \$36.02; Colorado, \$67.41; Idaho, \$52.30; Montana, \$62.14; Nebraska, \$38.23; Nevada, \$64.21; New Mexico, \$56.53; New York, \$29.32; Oregon, \$40.90; Utah, \$53.70; Wyoming, \$70.22.

Expenditures made by the Government as direct payments to Hawaii under cooperative arrangements and expenditures within Hawaii which provided relief and other aid, fiscal year 1949.¹

I. GRANTS TO THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

A. Department of Agriculture:

1. Agricultural experiment stations—Regular grants ² -----	\$98, 679
2. Research and Marketing Act of 1946—Regular grants ³ -----	18, 493
3. Cooperative Agricultural Extension Works—Regular grants ⁴ -----	171, 712
4. National school-lunch program—Regular grants ⁵ -----	230, 974
5. National-forest fund—Shared revenues ⁶ -----	None
6. Submarginal-land program payments—Shared revenues ⁷ -----	None
7. Forest-fire cooperation ⁸ -----	6, 760
8. Exportation and domestic consumption of Agricultural commodities ⁹ -----	134, 383
Subtotal-----	661, 001

B. Department of Commerce—Civil Aeronautics Administration:

9. Federal-aid airport program—Regular grant ¹⁰ -----	344, 991
--	----------

C. Department of the Interior:

10. Federal aid, wildlife restoration—Regular grant ¹¹ -----	2, 954
11. Payments from receipts under Mineral Leasing Act—Shared Revenues ¹² -----	None
12. Payments from receipts under Migratory Bird Conservation Act and Alaska game law—Shared revenues ¹³ -----	None
13. Payments under various special funds—Shared revenues ¹⁴ -----	None

D. Department of the Army:

14. Lease of flood-control lands—Shared revenues ¹⁵ -----	None
--	------

E. Federal Security Agency—United States:

15. Colleges for agricultural and mechanical arts (Office of Education)—Regular grants ¹⁶ -----	74, 831
16. Cooperative vocational education (Office of Education)—Regular grants ¹⁷ -----	165, 000
17. Venereal-disease control (U. S. Public Health Service)—Regular grants ¹⁸ -----	38, 514
18. Tuberculosis control (U. S. Public Health Service)—Regular grants ¹⁹ -----	81, 816

¹ Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of the Finances, fiscal year 1949, Treasury Department, Doc. 3162 (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office: 1950), pp. 567-575.

² 7 U. S. C. 301-308, 361-386f, 369a, 427-427g; Public Law 712, 80th Cong., 2d sess., approved June 19, 1948.

³ Act of Aug. 14, 1946, Public Law 733 (7 U. S. C. 427, 427h-j), Public Law 712, 80th Cong., 2d sess., approved June 19, 1948.

⁴ 1 U. S. C. 301-308, 341-348, 343c-343e-343f-343-g; Public Law 712, 80th Cong., 2d sess., approved June 19, 1948.

⁵ Act of June 22, 1946, 60 Stat. 290 (42 U. S. C. 751-760), Public Law 712, 80th Cong., 2d sess., approved June 19, 1948.

⁶ 16 U. S. C. 500.

⁷ 7 U. S. C. 1012; Public Law 712, 80th Cong., 2d sess., approved June 19, 1948.

⁸ 16 U. S. C. 564-570, 581; Public Law 712, 80th Cong., 2d sess., approved June 19, 1948.

⁹ Act of Aug. 24, 1935, 49 Stat. 774, sec. 321, as amended: 7 U. S. C. 612c.

¹⁰ Act of May 13, 1946, 60 Stat. 171.

¹¹ Act of Sept. 2, 1937, 50 Stat. 917.

¹² 30 U. S. C. 191.

¹³ 16 U. S. C. 715c; 48 U. S. C. 199.

¹⁴ Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (43 U. S. C. 315i, 315j); proceeds of public-lands sales (31 U. S. C. 711, par. 17), act of June 28, 1941, 55 Stat. 310; payments to certain counties in certain States in lieu of taxes on grant lands, Act of June 9, 1916, 39 Stat. 222; act of Aug. 28, 1937, 50 Stat. 375; payments to Arizona and Nevada, Boulder Canyon project (43 U. S. C. 617a, f).

¹⁵ Flood Control Act of 1938, as amended (52 Stat. 1221-1222).

¹⁶ 7 U. S. C. 321, 343e, g; 54 Stat. 582.

¹⁷ 29 U. S. C. 31-45b; 20 U. S. C. 15h-15p; 54 Stat. 583, 29-30; 29 U. S. C. 31-35.

¹⁸ 42 U. S. C. 24, 25; 52 Stat. 439, 440.

¹⁹ Act of July 1, 1944, 58 Stat. 693, sec. 314(b).

E. Federal Security Agency—United States—Continued

19. General health assistance (U. S. Public Health Service)—Regular grants ²⁰ -----	\$47, 991
20. Mental health activities (U. S. Public Health Service)—Regular grants ²¹ -----	24, 576
21. Hospital survey and planning (U. S. Public Health Service)—Regular grants ²² -----	None
22. Maternal and child-health services (Social Security Administration)—Regular grants ²³ -----	137, 657
23. Services for crippled children (Social Security Administration)—Regular grants ²⁴ -----	126, 420
24. Child-welfare services (Social Security Administration)—Regular grants ²⁴ -----	42, 451
25. Emergency maternity and infant care (Social Security Administration)—Emergency Grants ²⁴ -----	5, 027
26. Old-age assistance (Social Security Administration)—Regular grants ²⁴ -----	634, 490
27. Aid to dependent children (Social Security Administration)—Regular grants ²⁴ -----	815, 515
28. Aid to blind (Social Security Administration)—Regular grants ²⁴ -----	25, 662
29. Unemployment compensation and employment service administration (Social Security Administration)—Regular grants ²⁵ -----	339, 409
30. Vocational rehabilitation—Regular grants ²⁶ -----	99, 493
31. To promote the education of the blind—Regular grants ²⁷ -----	319
Subtotal -----	2, 659, 171

F. Federal Works Agency:

32. Advance planning for public works—Emergency grants ²⁸ -----	65, 000
33. Veterans' educational facilities—Emergency grants-----	106
34. Community facilities—Emergency grants-----	6, 392
35. Maintenance and operation of schools—Emergency grants-----	None
36. Highway construction (Public Roads Administration)—Regular grants ²⁹ -----	1, 109, 446
37. Highway construction (Public Roads)—Emergency grants ³⁰ -----	3, 101, 080
Subtotal -----	4, 282, 024

G. Public Housing Administration:

38. Federal public-housing annual contributions—Regular grants ³¹ -----	None
39. Veterans' rehousing program—Emergency grants-----	15, 348

H. Veterans' Administration:

40. Homes for disabled soldiers and sailors—Regular grants ³² -----	None
41. Supervision of on-the-job training—Regular grants ³³ -----	6, 356
42. Administration of unemployment and self-employment allowances—Regular grants ³³ -----	73, 704

Total, regular and emergency grants to the Territory of Hawaii ----- 8, 045, 549

²⁰ Act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 693, sec. 314 (c)); act of Aug. 14, 1935 (42 U. S. C. 801-803).

²¹ Act of July 8, 1947 (61 Stat. 269).

²² Act of Aug. 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1040-49).

²³ Act of Aug. 14, 1935, as amended (42 U. S. C. 701-731).

²⁴ 42 U. S. C. 301-306, 1201-1206.

²⁵ Act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U. S. C. 49-491); act of Aug. 14, 1935, 49 Stat. sec. 301, 302; 29 U. S. C. 49-491.

²⁶ Act of July 3, 1945, 59 Stat. 374.

²⁷ 20 U. S. C. 101, 102.

²⁸ Repayable advance contingent on future construction of public-works projects.

²⁹ 23 U. S. C. 1-117; act of June 29, 1948, 62 Stat. 1105; act of July 30, 1947, Public Law 269; act of April 20, 1948, Public Law 491.

³⁰ Includes \$2,044,967 for war damage and emergency (seismic wave) damage; act of Aug. 8, 1946, Public Law 663, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 948.

³¹ 42 U. S. C. 1410.

³² 24 U. S. C. 134.

³³ Act of June 22, 1944, 58 Stat. 290.

II. AID PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUALS, ETC., WITHIN THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

I. Department of Agriculture:

43. Agricultural conservation program ³⁴----- \$7, 684, 349

J. Department of the Army:

44. Reimbursement for education of dependents of river and harbor and flood-control construction personnel ³⁵----- None
45. National Guard ³⁶----- 1, 743, 128

K. Federal Security Agency:

46. Reconversion unemployment benefits for seamen ³⁷----- 1, 600
47. Cancer control (U. S. Public Health Service) ³⁸----- 11, 225

Subtotal ----- 12, 825

L. Federal Works Agency:

48. Forest highway ³⁹----- None
49. Disaster and emergency relief ⁴⁰----- 347, 852
50. Construction services (Public Buildings Administration) ⁴¹----- None

M. Veterans' Administration:

51. Automobiles for disabled veterans ⁴²----- None
52. Veterans' readjustment benefits and vocational rehabilitation ⁴³----- 4, 853, 060

Total, Federal aid payments to individuals in the Territory of Hawaii----- 14, 641, 214

Grand total, all Federal payments, Territory of Hawaii-- 22, 686, 763

³⁴ Conservation and use of agricultural land resources, act of Feb. 29, 1936, 16 U. S. C. 590g-590q; administration of the Sugar Act of 1937, 7. U. S. C. 1100-1183.³⁵ Act of July 24, 1946, 60 Stat. 637, secs. 6, 9.³⁶ 32 U. S. C. 21, 22.³⁷ Act of Aug. 10, 1946, 60 Stat. 982.³⁸ Act of Apr. 19, 1946, 60 Stat. 106.³⁹ Act of Dec. 20, 1944, sec. 10 (a), 58 Stat. 838-843.⁴⁰ Act of June 22, 1944, 38 Stat. 290.⁴¹ Act of June 15, 1938, 40 U. S. C. 265.⁴² Act of Aug. 8, 1946, Public Law 663.⁴³ Act of Mar. 24, 1943, 57 Stat. 43; act of June 22, 1944, 58 Stat. 284.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would like to have permission to have incorporated in the record a summary of editorial comment since the House passed the bill calling for statehood for Hawaii. The Hawaii Statehood Commission has prepared these data.

The CHAIRMAN. Gathered from newspapers, magazines, in the United States, I take it?

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, that will be received.

(The summary of editorial comment furnished by the Hawaii Statehood Commission is as follows:)

NINETY-FIVE PERCENT EDITORIAL SUPPORT FOR STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII SHOWN

Analysis of 486 editorials collected in the 2 months since the House passed Hawaii's statehood bill in March shows overwhelming support for State government for Hawaii. Only 21 editors oppose it.

On March 7, 1950, the United States House of Representatives passed H. R. 49, Hawaii's statehood bill, by a vote of 262-110. In the next 7 weeks the Hawaii Statehood Commission received from a press clipping service 465 editorials favoring statehood. The collection contained statehood editorials from each of the 48 States.

Since the opening of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress this year, the Hawaii Statehood Commission has received 1,017 editorials on the subject of statehood for Hawaii. Of these, 995, or 97 percent, favor statehood.

Opposition stems from the three usual arguments: Noncontiguity, race and small States.

The widespread national support for statehood for Hawaii is considered unusual by some people, for most issues confronting Congress do not show such unanimity of favorable public opinion as does statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. In the discussion of the Hawaii Homes Commission project, request was made for data on land in Hawaii. That data is available in documents prepared by Mr. Collin G. Lennox, president of the Territorial board of agriculture and forestry, and I would like to submit them for the record and ask that it be incorporated in the proper place.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be received and printed.

(The summary of Hawaii Homes Commission lands on all islands is as follows:)

Data on lands in Hawaii, presented as follows:

1. Summary of Hawaii Homes Commission lands on all islands.
2. Summary of lands use classification.
3. Landownership, Territory of Hawaii.
4. Revenues from public lands in Hawaii.

Summary of Hawaii Homes Commission lands on all islands

Land-use classification	Hawaii	Maui	Molokai	Oahu	Kauai	Total area
Business, house lots, rights-of-way, etc.....	250	20	500	175	-----	945
Good agricultural land.....	3,500	-----	4,000	-----	2,000	9,500
Fair or potential land.....	1,000	-----	2,000	-----	1,500	4,500
Good pasture land.....	36,486	-----	-----	-----	-----	36,486
Medium pasture land.....	23,000	5,900	-----	1,500	-----	30,400
Poor pasture land.....	23,000	10,000	15,000	1,000	10,000	59,000
Forest reserve:						
Watersheds.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	2,270	2,270
Forest products and protection.....	1,096	-----	-----	200	-----	1,296
Public hunting.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	7,600	7,600
Wastelands.....	3,203	4,188	4,476	152	5,369	17,387
Total.....	91,535	20,108	25,975	3,027	28,739	169,384

Summary of land-use classification—All “public lands” (crown and government) excluding those under executive order to the Territory of Hawaii, county and Federal agencies and Hawaii Homes Commission Land

Land use

	Area acres
Business, house lots, rights-of-way, etc.....	1,253
Good agricultural land.....	35,748
Fair to potential agricultural land.....	6,538
Good pasture ¹	59,861
Medium to fair pasture.....	44,556
Subtotal.....	147,961
Poor pasture.....	182,913
Subtotal.....	330,874
Watersheds (revenue producing).....	77,358
Subtotal.....	408,232
Watersheds (nonrevenue).....	402,619
Forest reserves—Forest products, soil protection.....	82,316
Recreation—Public hunting.....	167,263
Subtotal.....	1,060,430
Waste.....	279,419
Grand total.....	1,339,849

¹ Some of these lands may be useful for agricultural purposes, particularly orchard crops.

NOTE.—All classifications of a preliminary nature.

Land ownership, Territory of Hawaii, June 30, 1948

	Total acres	Percent of total
Federal agencies.....	226, 743	5½
Territorial agencies for public purposes:		
Forest reserves.....	677, 452	
Game reserves.....	160, 500	
Counties.....	4, 082	
Territorial departments.....	22, 049	
Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920.....	864, 083	21
Public lands managed by Territory:	169, 384	4
Homesteads, house lots, and business property under sales agreement or right of purchase leases.....	4, 305	
General leases and licenses.....	441, 413	
Unencumbered lands, including unallotted homesteads and house lots.....	4, 177	
Miscellaneous reserves.....	897	
Wastes, surveyed.....	45, 214	
Privately owned lands.....	496, 006	12
	2, 362, 608	57½
Total.....	4, 118, 827	100

Source: Compiled from records of the Commissioner of Public Lands and the Board of Agriculture and Forestry, Territory of Hawaii, April 1950.

Revenues from public lands in Hawaii, fiscal years 1946-48

Forest lands:	
Water licenses.....	\$313, 584. 02
Permits for water.....	35, 208. 96
Subtotal.....	348, 792. 98
Rentals on public lands: ¹	
Licenses for special purposes.....	8, 694. 94
Escheats.....	34. 95
Rentals:	
Long-term leases.....	1, 712, 401. 05
Unleased lands.....	39, 247. 62
Subtotal.....	1, 760, 378. 56
Miscellaneous fees.....	140, 741. 75
Interest.....	35, 798. 63
Subtotal.....	176, 540. 38
Total.....	2, 285, 711. 92
Sale of assets:	
Sale of lands.....	345, 026. 56
Sale of house lots, etc.....	11, 079. 57
Subtotal.....	357, 106. 13
Grand total, all revenues.....	2, 642, 818. 05

¹ Includes rentals from lands of Hawaiian Homes Commission which totaled \$139,599.47. These are paid over to the Commission.

Compiled from Report of the Commissioner of Public Lands and Surveys of the Territory of Hawaii for the 2 years ending June 30, 1948.

MR. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Gardner Anthony in his testimony referred to the circumstances under which Mr. Frank G. Silva was removed as a delegate from the constitutional convention because of his refusal to testify before the Un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. Samuel Wilder King, who was chairman of the committee, addressed a letter to Mr. Walter on that subject outlining the details

of the circumstances of that case. I believe it is appropriate that that be included or incorporated in the record after Mr. Anthony's remarks.

It is a letter from Mr. King to Mr. Walter of the Un-American Activities Committee. It amplifies that information.

The CHAIRMAN. Inasmuch as I was not present at the time the testimony was offered, I desire to ask the members of the committee whether there is any objection to the request of Delegate Farrington.

Senator TAYLOR. I have no objection.

Senator BUTLER. No objection.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no objection, the material will be inserted as requested.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would like to ask that Mr. Victor S. K. Houston, chairman of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, be given an opportunity to extend his remarks at the end of his testimony in reply to some of the points made by Mr. Nobriga.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would also like to request that former Delegate Samuel Wilder King, the chairman of the Hawaii Statehood Commission, be given an opportunity to present a letter in rebuttal to some of the points made during the course of the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
HAWAII STATEHOOD COMMISSION,
Washington 1, D. C., May 5, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*United States Senator, Chairman, Senate Interior
and Insular Affairs Committee,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: In checking over the various points that were brought up during the progress of the hearings on H. R. 49, which have just been completed, I note that questions were raised on which I desire to submit additional comment for inclusion in the hearings, with your permission.

First, let me express my very great appreciation for your courtesy and patience, and that of the other members of the committee, in giving all of the witnesses who came from Hawaii an opportunity to be heard and to file statements. Although some of them would have liked to have had more time, they all realized that in many cases their statements would have covered the same ground. I express the feeling of every witness from Hawaii in extending to you and your colleagues on the committee our thanks, and, in the Hawaiian phrase, our Aloha for your consideration.

I. OPPOSITION WITNESSES

Some question was raised as to why the Hawaiian delegation did not include witnesses who might want to oppose statehood for Hawaii. Of course it has been said repeatedly that the opposition to statehood in Hawaii comprises a very small number of people.

Nevertheless, there is some opposition and a few persons have publicly expressed their views against statehood. They were free to come here to attend these hearings if they desired or to file statements for the record. But neither the Hawaii Statehood Commission nor the hold-over committee of the legislature of 1949 would be justified in financing their appearance.

Several of those who have publicly gone on record as opposed to statehood are persons of means who could have financed their trip to Washington themselves, just as several witnesses did who appeared here in favor of statehood.

One opponent who cabled the committee from Hawaii has opposed statehood since it was first actively pressed upon the attention of Congress in 1935. His opposition was previously based on racial grounds. It now appears to be based on the issue of communism and its influence in the Democratic Party in Hawaii, of which party he is a member.

The question of the support of statehood with public funds was tested in the courts of Hawaii and the authority of the legislature to appropriate money for the promotion of statehood was upheld by the Territorial Supreme Court. The court did state that such public funds could not be used, however, for general advertising.

The contention that opposition to statehood would evoke some punitive action by its proponents is ridiculous. I know of no single instance where there has been any effort at reprisals against those who have on different occasions expressed their arguments against statehood.

II. COMMUNISM

Anyone familiar with Hawaii and its people will not subscribe for a moment to the belief that communism can ever gain any headway in the islands. Only through infiltrating the labor movement has it had any success. The exposure of such infiltration by the House Un-American Activities Committee will prevent it from using organized labor as an agency for advancing its program.

As a Republican, I hesitate to comment on the results of the Democratic Party convention recently held in Honolulu. It does appear that some 15 delegates to this convention were among those who refused to testify before the House Un-American Activities Committee. I am informed that they had been elected to the convention before being subpoenaed by the latter committee.

Why they were not unseated by the Democratic Party convention I do not know nor do I know why five of them were elected to the central committee of the Democratic Party in Hawaii.

There are other considerations involved in the action of the convention which have no bearing on communism, and with which I am not familiar.

As a Republican, however, and one who has often campaigned for public office, I am as certain as any human being can be that the Democratic Party is not dominated or influenced by communism; and will, in its own time and by its own action, clear itself of any such suspicion.

I was a candidate for election to the Hawaii constitutional convention from the fifth representative district. This district is normally strongly Democratic, and contains the homes of a proportionately large number of workingmen, where the ILWU locals are stronger than in other parts of the island of Oahu.

Nevertheless, I led the ticket of 20 candidates at large, and was elected outright in the primary, or first election. I attribute my success to my well-known advocacy of statehood. The voters disregarded partisanship in this campaign and certainly did not support the ILWU ticket.

III. DUAL CITIZENSHIP

The matter of dual citizenship was mentioned at one meeting. The Joint Congressional Committee on Hawaii made an exhaustive study of that problem in 1937. On pages 43 and 44 of its report, Senate Document 151, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, the subject was discussed in some detail.

It was noted that the problem was one of international relations rather than a local question, and applied to the children of nationals of many countries besides Japan.

Since the end of World War II, the question has become somewhat academic, as most of the nations that claimed jurisdiction over their former nationals or the children of those nationals, regardless of their naturalization as American citizens, or their birth in the United States, were our enemies in that war.

Their reorganized governments have relinquished such claims. Specifically, Japan has relinquished any claims to the children of its nationals who are born in the United States.

IV. ECONOMIC SITUATION

Some question was raised as to whether Hawaii could maintain its economy at the high level that has previously existed.

It is true that temporarily we are passing through a rather difficult period. The reasons for the situation have been stated.

The readjustment from war to normal conditions; the two maritime strikes, the San Francisco strike and the Honolulu water-front strike; and the very drastic reduction in Army and Navy activities in the Territory have all caused a great loss of income in the past 2 years as compared to the immediately preceding years.

However, our normal activities will produce more than adequate funds for the maintenance of a healthy economy even if it must be accomplished by some relatively minor loss of population.

Some of our Filipino population, formerly nationals of the United States, have become aliens through the consummation of independence for the Philippine Islands. Many of them are returning and will continue to return to the Philippines. However, under recent legislation many of this alien group are becoming citizens by naturalization.

The Filipinos who are citizens of the United States have become a permanent part of our population.

The war's activities brought in many people from the mainland. A considerable number have returned to their former homes when employment conditions became difficult.

Our unemployment problem is an acute one. It will need the joint efforts of the national and local governments to solve. We should have the help of the National Government because the sudden and drastic reduction in military and naval expenditures is largely responsible for the present situation. Even a moderate resumption of such activities would be the greatest single contribution to the unemployment problem.

Other measures will take longer to show results, but they can and will solve the problem in time.

We may have to cut down on some expenditures for a short period until our revenues pick up again. That they will pick up I am convinced. For many years Hawaii was a one-crop country entirely dependent upon the sugar industry. The introduction of pineapple cultivation and its gradual development made us a two-crop country with a better balanced economy.

Since then, the tourist trade, interrupted during the war, has gradually grown into a major industry. It can be further developed to provide us with a third industry. It should also be noted that even the severe cuts in Army and Navy expenditures has not eliminated that source of revenue entirely.

New industries will undoubtedly be discovered in the same way as the pineapple industry was developed. Before 1908, no one in Hawaii would have prophesied the development which has taken place in the pineapple industry.

Despite one witness' skepticism, I believe the flower and foliage industry can become a very substantial source of income to many people in Hawaii. The macadamia nut industry is also capable of much greater growth and is an ideal small-farmer crop. The tuna canning industry has plans that will make it one of the largest of the secondary sources of income. The production of papayas and other tropical fruits give promise of considerable expansion, and also furnishes ideal small-farmer cash crops. Coffee is still one of our stable minor crops. Others not yet visualized may develop just as the pineapple industry developed.

It is also true that in addition to producing more goods for sale in mainland markets, we can produce more goods for local consumption and not only increase our revenues but also cut down on some expenditures.

Very complete studies of the economic problem, including opportunities for employment, are being made. They should result in affirmative action soon.

There is no doubt that Hawaii can maintain itself with the highest American standard of living for all of its people in the future as it has in the past.

V. HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION ACT

H. R. 49 requires that the constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii shall incorporate in its provisions the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, as amended, as a part thereof, not subject to change by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, except in minor particulars, without the consent and approval of the United States. The justification of this provision was questioned by some members of the committee.

The history of the inception of the Hawaiian Homes Commission program would take too long to review here. It was intended as a means of rehabilitating the Hawaiian people by offering them an opportunity to obtain homes and small farms or small ranches on terms within their means.

This law is limited in its application to Hawaiians of not less than half Hawaiian blood and is purely voluntary. Only those who wish to do so may take advantage of the provisions of the act.

I have been familiar with this program since its beginning in 1920. For 5 years it was limited to one project on an experimental basis and was not to go into full effect until that experimental project was declared a success.

It is also true that the original financing was inadequate and a good deal of time and money was lost before the program began to function efficiently.

The program supplements but does not replace the general homesteading law of the Territory, as laid down in section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act.

Under the provisions of the above section, land from the public domain has been and is being made available to all of the citizens of Hawaii. A much larger area is available for this purpose than the area set aside under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

The program for the native Hawaiians is thus merely a specialized form of the general policy, with 99-year leases at nominal rental being granted the applicants instead of long-term-purchase agreements.

Modest loans for financing homes and other improvements are made from a revolving fund; but the value of the land is not a charge against the lessee.

With the lessons learned from the first years of trial and error, the program is now proceeding efficiently.

In reply to the contentions advanced by those opposed who desire to have this section omitted, I should like to make the following points:

1. That the original act was approved by the Territorial legislature and was passed by Congress at the request of Hawaii. In fact, a legislative commission came to Washington to urge the passage of the act in support of its sponsor, former Delegate Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaʻole.

2. The act is now a part of the Organic Act and if statehood were not granted would continue to be a part of the basic law of the Territory unless amended by Congress of its own initiative or in response to a request from our legislature.

3. Though authorized by Federal law, the Hawaiian Homes Commission is a Territorial agency whose members are appointed by the Governor of Hawaii and confirmed by the Senate of Hawaii.

4. The program has been financed entirely from local funds. A certain proportion of the rentals received by the Territory for public lands and water licenses is used to build up a revolving fund from which loans to the homesteaders are made. All of the rentals of the Hawaiian Homes Commission lands which are not under lease to the homesteaders is used to finance the program. In addition, the legislature has been very generous in appropriating large sums for the development of various projects particularly in providing adequate supplies of water.

5. The improvements carried on under the act become a part of the general physical improvement of the Territory. The roads and bridges that are built to provide access to the different areas are owned by the Territory or counties and used by the general public. In some cases, the water developed is available to others besides the Hawaiian homesteaders.

6. The program has had the support of the people of Hawaii. By repeated legislative acts, it has been endorsed and expanded. There is no disposition on the part of the Hawaiian public to question the desirability or the justice of this program with the exception of a very small minority.

I should also like to call your attention to the fact that in this instance the Territory is asking to have its program for the rehabilitation of the indigenous people financed through its own fund made a part of its constitution. The usual procedure has been for the Federal Government to enact legislation for similar purposes in the several States.

VI. CONTIGUITY

As to the question of contiguity, we of Hawaii have always believed that this issue was settled when Hawaii was annexed. The debate on this issue clearly shows that the advocates of annexation and incorporation realized that statehood was the destiny of this Territory. The United States Supreme Court has upheld this view.

In spite of this interpretation, if statehood is to be withheld from Hawaii because we are not contiguous to the North American mainland, then Congress must determine whether or not it would be just to require us to fulfill all of the obligations of citizenship without sharing all of the rights of that status.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL WILDER KING, *Chairman.*

Mr. FARRINGTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like also to present for the record a statement made by Richard Nixon as to the plans of the Un-American Activities Committee bearing on the relationship of this inquiry to the question of statehood for Hawaii.

The CHAIRMAN. Which inquiry?

Mr. FARRINGTON. The House Un-American Activities Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, yes. This was a general news release that Mr. Nixon gave out.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. As of February 21.

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. This is the Congressman from California.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes, sir.

(The news release referred to is as follows:)

[News release from the office of Richard M. Nixon, Member of Congress, 528 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.]

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman Richard Nixon)

A subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities plans to make a fact-finding investigation of Communist activities in Hawaii in April. As the ranking minority member of the committee, I should like to make two points clear with respect to this investigation.

First, the opponents of statehood for Hawaii should gain no comfort from this inquiry, which is being undertaken at the request of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii. Regardless of the outcome of the investigation, or of the subcommittee's recommendations as to what should be done about Communist activity in the Territory, the issue of communism in Hawaii should have no place in congressional debate on the subject of statehood. If this were a proper issue, we might well also consider the advisability of separating New York City from the Union.

Second, it should be noted that, among those forces which oppose statehood for Hawaii and are citing Communist infiltration of the islands as a reason for this opposition, there are many who have not been noted in the past for their concern over Communist activity within the continental borders of the United States.

Let us assume that, as an outcome of the committee's investigation, it is found that communism is rampant in Hawaii. In my opinion, this would be one of the best reasons that could be advanced for the cause of statehood, since a State government could then deal with the problem relatively free of the control now exercised over the Territory of Hawaii by a national administration which has on frequent occasions demonstrated its unwillingness to recognize the threat of communism within the United States.

A preliminary investigation of Communist activity in the islands has been conducted by members of the staff of the Un-American Activities Committee. This survey has conclusively shown that the great majority of persons who are engaged in Communist conspiratorial work are not permanent residents of the Territory but are individuals who have gone there from the mainland for the sole purpose of subversive infiltration. How can we possibly consider penalizing the people of Hawaii under such circumstances as these?

To assume that there are no Communists in Hawaii would, of course, be utterly naive. Hawaii is too important to have been overlooked by the enemies of our way of life. However, the problem of communism in Hawaii is a national one, just as it is in New York and California and everywhere else in the Nation. It is in that spirit that we must approach the Hawaiian phase of a threat that is Nation-wide and international. We must not fall into the error of attempting to isolate a whole segment of our people and of our territory, as we would in the case of leprosy, just because there are Communists among them.

California is Hawaii's nearest mainland neighbor. The majority of the people of the State of California have long favored statehood for Hawaii. I share that view, and as a Representative in Congress from California will do all I can to see that Hawaii gets the square deal she has so well earned.

A majority of the congressional delegation from California stands squarely behind legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood. Senator Knowland is one of the foremost champions of statehood in the United States Senate. Gov. Earl Warren has many times endorsed statehood for Hawaii. The State legislature

had gone on record with a resolution in favor of immediate statehood. The City Council of Los Angeles and the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco have endorsed statehood. The California State Chamber of Commerce and the chambers of commerce of most of California's principal cities have endorsed statehood. Many of California's civic, social, fraternal, and patriotic organizations have spoken out in favor of statehood.

I want to make it plain that insofar as I am concerned, the forthcoming inquiry into communism in the Territory of Hawaii is not predicated on a preconceived notion that Hawaii is anything but a loyal American community, nor does it carry any antistatehood connotations. On the contrary, it should aid the cause of statehood.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would also like to introduce in the record a news clipping covering a statement by Mr. McSweeney, of Ohio, upon his return to the States on the subject of communism in Hawaii.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be received.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I think I would also like to present a clipping containing a statement by Mr. Velde on the same subject.

The COMMITTEE. It may be received.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would also like to introduce a third clipping on the same subject by Mr. Harrison, of Virginia.

Senator BUTLER. Were they the other members of that committee?

Mr. FARRINGTON. They were all members of that Un-American Activities Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, all this material will be inserted as requested.

(The news clippings referred to are as follows:)

[From Star-Bulletin Bureau]

McSWEENEY SAYS RED PROBE AIDS STATEHOOD

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 19.—Representative John McSweeney (Democrat, Ohio), the first member of the Un-American Activities Committee to return to Washington, said today that, far from harming the statehood cause, the current inquiry in Hawaii will help it.

Mr. McSweeney, who was called home to Ohio last week and continued to Washington, said the hearings have cleared the atmosphere remarkably and served to indicate the source of trouble.

He said he had been told this by everyone he talked with in Honolulu, both civilians and military personnel, and that the people of the islands seemed to appreciate the removal of the vague but general suspicion which had been the case.

He said he was remarkably impressed by the public interest in the hearings, the intentness of those listeners who could find even standing room and their willingness to spend the entire day on their feet in order to hear.

As usual, he said, the actual number of Communists seems to be small. But he recalled that when he was in Italy with the Army he found there were proportionately few Fascists. The influence of a few can be very great, he said.

Mr. McSweeney had a fine word of praise for the conduct of the hearings and also for the work done by the committee's investigators, William Wheeler and Courtney Owens.

When I went there I expected to see the hearings drag along for a few days while the witnesses were made ready, he said.

Instead, it went like clockwork.

COMMUNISM SAID NO MORE SERIOUS HERE THAN IN OTHER PARTS OF UNITED STATES—REPRESENTATIVE VELDE SAYS PROBE AN AID TO STATEHOOD

Communism is no more serious in Hawaii than in any other part of America, a House Un-American Activities Committee member said Wednesday.

As the Hawaii investigations of the committee came to a close Harold H. Velde (Republican, Illinois) issued a press statement saying that the hearings actually have aided Hawaii's chances for statehood.

But he warned loyal Americans in the ILWU to be extremely vigilant in all union meetings to counter the Communist activity that has been shown here.

His full statement follows:

"The hearings conducted by the committee during the past 2 weeks have demonstrated very clearly the technique used by the Communist Party.

"It infiltrates its members into positions of authority in labor unions, the schools, and other free institutions, then by using sneak tactics, dominates these institutions under secret instructions from the Kremlin.

"HAS EXPOSED TACTICS

"The [Un-American Activities] Committee, operating on a nonpartisan basis, has exposed the Communist Party tactics used to control the ILWU and some other labor organizations in the Territory of Hawaii.

"There is still a big job remaining—a job which the real Americans of Hawaii must and can do.

"The loyal American members of the ILWU must be extremely vigilant at all union meetings, but especially at those meetings when an election of officers is held to make sure that loyal Americans are in positions of authority.

"That is the American way to handle the problem of communism in Hawaii and I am confident Hawaii can handle it that way.

"AID TO STATE HOPES

"The problem of communism in Hawaii, as I see it, is no more serious than in any other part of America.

"These hearings, instead of hurting Hawaii's chances for statehood, in my opinion, have helped them. It seems to me that Hawaii as a State can meet its problems much more easily and efficiently than Hawaii as a Territory."

SENATOR BUTLER'S STATEMENT BLASTED—COMMUNISM DOESN'T RULE HERE, SAYS CONGRESSMAN BURR HARRISON

Senator Hugh Butler's statement that communism seems to be the exception in the States and the rule in Hawaii, was blasted by Congressmen who had just completed an un-American activities investigation here.

"I completely disagree," said Representative Burr P. Harrison (Democrat, Virginia), the only committee member present who voted against Hawaiian statehood in the House March 7.

Representative Harrison continued:

"For reasons entirely independent of this investigation, I leave Hawaii still undecided at the moment as to the wisdom of statehood—but this is not based on any thought of Un-Americanism on the part of the people of Hawaii.

"ALERT AMERICANS HERE

"One cannot be here for any short time without being impressed with how intensely American the people are.

"Where people back in the States take Americanism too much for granted, the people of Hawaii are thoroughly aware of the value of the Constitution, more personally aware than people on the mainland.

"It is very important to those persons to say that there has not been a thing produced in evidence here that should be used against the Territory on the question of statehood.

"I am confident that the people of Hawaii themselves can be relied on to clear out the few vermin who have infiltrated the positions of power in the Territory.

"FROM MAINLAND

"After all, this Communist drive was directed from the mainland of the United States. The real brainy rats among them were sent out here from the mainland of the United States.

"The positions which they occupy in the union are those to which they were not elected, as I understand it. They were selected by Bridges and his gang.

"Now that they have been exposed, the people of Hawaii can be relied on to do the job of tossing them out.

"Jack Hall and his crowd, in my opinion, are on their last legs here."

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would like to have permission also to incorporate a statement in the record by Congressman Walter made to the press.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be received by the committee.

(The statement to be furnished is as follows:)

[From Honolulu Star Bulletin, April 10, 1950]

REPRESENTATIVE WALTER SAYS ISLAND ABLE TO COMBAT COMMUNISM

Representative Francis E. Walter (Democrat-Pennsylvania) called Hawaii the Gibraltar of the Pacific in an opening statement, noting that the committee has no desire to hurt either statehood or the labor movement.

"The purpose of this investigation," he said, "is to determine the extent, the character and the objects of Communist activities in the Territory of Hawaii."

* * * * *

"There is no greater power than the power of public opinion and if as the result of these hearings there be a public disclosure of Communist activities in the Territory of Hawaii, this committee believes that the integrity, character, and loyalty of the people of these islands, of all races and creeds, is such that communism will find no haven here and that it will promptly be eradicated by an informed public opinion."

TEXT OF STATEMENT

The text of Representative Walter's statement follows:

"Pursuant to statutory authority and in response to requests embodied in a joint resolution of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii and in resolutions of certain civic organizations, which resolutions were referred by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to this committee, the Committee on un-American Activities of the House of Representatives opens its hearings today in Honolulu on the subject of communism."

* * * * *

"This committee from time to time has investigated un-American activities of Fascist, Nazi, and other totalitarianisms designed to overthrow by force and violence the democratic form of government under which we live."

"The Communist conspiracy in many forms, including that of espionage by foreign agents, has been brought to light in investigations conducted by this committee."

"With the revelation of Communist infiltration in education, entertainment, government, labor, and other fields of endeavor, this committee has devoted much of its time in the past few years to the subject of communism."

MANY INVESTIGATIONS

"These investigations have been conducted in numerous cities and States on the mainland, the latest being in the western part of my own State, Pennsylvania. It is the duty of this committee to expose communism wherever found within its jurisdiction."

* * * * *

"The purpose of this investigation is to determine the extent, character, and objects of Communist activities in the Territory of Hawaii."

* * * * *

"There is no greater power than the power of public opinion, and if as a result of these hearings there be a public disclosure of Communist activities in the Territory of Hawaii, this committee believes that the integrity, character, and loyalty of the people of these islands, of all races and creeds, is such that communism will find no haven here, and that it will be promptly eradicated by an informed public opinion."

"In approaching its task, the committee cannot be unmindful of the fact that Hawaii is our Gibraltar of the Pacific—a vital link in the security of our west coast."

"RED PEARL HARBOR

"Nor can we be unmindful of the aggressive designs of Soviet imperialism in the Pacific area. Our hearings should alert Hawaii and the entire American Nation to the dangers of a Red Pearl Harbor."

"Anticipating, from our experience in other important investigations, the smear campaign which will be directed against this inquiry by the Communist slander apparatus and its supporters, I wish to clear up certain possible misconceptions at the outset.

"It will be said that the facts sought out at these hearings will injure the campaign for statehood in Hawaii. Our hearings will in no way involve the merits of this proposal. Speaking for myself as an individual Member of Congress, I wish to make it plain that I am a strong advocate of granting immediate statehood.

"Other members of our committee have taken a similar position in the House of Representatives. But this matter is outside of the specific purview of our present inquiry.

"If loyal citizens expose the machinations of this subversive organization during the course of this investigation, then the menace, if one exists, can be fought by the people in their own way, and those favoring statehood will owe a great debt of gratitude to those who assist in such an exposure.

"It will also be alleged by the Communists and their apologists that we are motivated by a desire to injure the labor movement. Nothing could be further from the truth, as will be demonstrated by any impartial review of the investigations conducted by this committee.

"Make no mistake about it. The Communists will shriek from the very house-tops that the present inquiry is directed against persons of Asiatic descent, that we are interested in promoting racial discrimination.

"ROBINSON'S STATEMENT

"They would have you forget that it was before our committee on July 18, 1949, that Jackie Robinson, that famous second baseman of the Brooklyn Dodgers made his ringing statement which echoed all over the United States. Let me recall a few words from that memorable statement:

"I and other Americans of many races and faiths have too much invested in our country's welfare for any of us to throw it away because of a siren song sung in bass. I am a religious man. Therefore I cherish America where I am free to worship as I please, a privilege which some countries do not give. And I suspect that 999 out of almost any thousand colored Americans you meet will tell you the same thing."

"Today we are confronted with a new menace—the menace of totalitarian communism, which would destroy our democracy and lead us all down the road to slavery. This menace must be pitilessly exposed for what it is.

"It is my firm conviction that the people of Hawaii will leave no stone unturned to unmask this hideous conspiracy.

"It is quite possible that Communist cunning has succeeded in misleading some people in Hawaii just as it has misled some people elsewhere in the United States with their glorious but false promises. They should not be victimized for such mistakes.

"But you cannot win people and hold them in any part of the world with lies. Sooner or later truth will triumph right here in Hawaii, elsewhere in the United States, and in foreign countries. We have arrived at the inevitable day of reckoning for the Reds.

"EXPERIENCE WITH REDS

"As one who has had some experience with the methods of the Communists, I know that they will not hesitate to resort to any and every method of terrorism to prevent exposure.

"Red gangsters can be expected to act true to form. Let me issue this stern and solemn warning, however.

"I shall not hesitate to invoke all the power at my command as chairman of these sessions against any individual or individuals who attempt to interfere with the duly authorized functions of this congressional committee.

"The citizens of Hawaii have written a noble page in American history during the last war against totalitarian fascism. They have faced death with unflinching heroism and self-sacrifice.

Mr. FARRINGTON. The Department of the Interior informs me that they will have available for the committee early next week a detailed report on the convention of the Democratic Party which took place on Sunday in Honolulu.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has been advised that the Secretary has undertaken to have detailed inquiry made, the results of which will be made available to the committee.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I believe, Mr. Chairman, it is appropriate that they answer it and that the answer be made by the Democrats inasmuch as I happen to be a Republican.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. You do not want to undertake to answer for the Democratic organization.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I undertake to represent all of the people of the Territory and I will touch on it, but on the detail of it, I do not want to make any further comment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has received an extraordinary number of resolutions and messages and letters requesting statehood for Hawaii. But I want to add very briefly to that record by referring at this time to a few resolutions that are quite characteristic of this activity and by way of showing the expression of sentiment stem from something more than organized propaganda, that they stem from a deep feeling on the part of our people, that we are entitled to statehood now.

I have received only 2 days ago, for instance, a resolution adopted by Mana School up in Kekaha, Kauai, T. H., a small grammar school in one of our country districts. It outlines very succinctly the arguments for statehood and declares "We have no fear of communism." It says, "We love the ideals, traditions, and system of free enterprise in America. We want statehood." This comes from children. It represents the feeling of the people at the grass roots of Hawaii. It is an eloquent bit of testimony. The people of our islands feel this question deeply, we feel that we should be admitted to the Union as a State right now.

Senator BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I might say to the delegate that I have received similar letters from school children here in the United States. I do not know how they happen to write me. But the letters were pretty much along the same line and I suspect that maybe they were victims of some propaganda agency—not yours, but some sort of a propaganda agency that suggested it.

Mr. FARRINGTON. The school children of Hawaii have a practice of exchanging letters with the school children in the States. We have something like 2,000 boys and girls in the colleges of the country and every single one of those boys and girls constitutes himself as a representative of the Territory and an advocate of statehood.

There is an organization with a Hawaiian name which means Messengers of Hawaii or the Delegates of Hawaii. You will find their influence exerting itself wherever students from Hawaii appear.

The war veterans have also adopted recently another resolution on this subject. They contend in this resolution that by granting statehood to Hawaii "the United States of America will positively demonstrate to the world its adherence to democratic principles and ideals

that it advocates" and adds that "there is no valid reason for denying statehood to Hawaii." It points out that repeated congressional investigations have been made and have revealed that the Territory of Hawaii has met every requirement to become a State of the Union.

The veterans feel this question very deeply. I am sure those who heard the testimony of some of the veterans who came in here, among them men who were disabled, will agree that they regard this question as one of paramount importance and interest.

This support of statehood extends to the commercial and business people, the conservative people of the Territory. I have another resolution here illustrating this, which I would like to have inserted in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be done.

(The resolution referred to is as follows:)

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY VETERANS OF THE FOUR HUNDRED AND FORTY-SECOND COMBAT TEAM, ONE HUNDREDTH INFANTRY BATTALION, MILITARY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE AND THE ONE THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED AND NINETY-NINTH ENGINEERS

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii is incorporated into the United States of America and is an integral part thereof; and

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii aspires to become a State in the Union of sovereign States; and

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has demonstrated its capacity for self-government; and

Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii have unequivocally demonstrated in time of war and peace its loyalty to the United States of America; and

Whereas the American people have repeatedly expressed their desire to admit the Territory of Hawaii into the Union; and

Whereas President Harry S. Truman has repeatedly urged immediate statehood for Hawaii; and

Whereas Interior Secretary Oscar Chapman, Defense Secretary Louis Johnson, and other high public officials have unqualifiedly endorsed statehood for Hawaii; and

Whereas the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America has recently voted decisively in favor of the Hawaiian statehood bill; and

Whereas by granting statehood to Hawaii the United States of America will positively demonstrate to the world its adherence to democratic principles and ideals that it advocates; and

Whereas no valid reason for denying statehood to Hawaii exists, but repeated congressional investigations have revealed that the Territory of Hawaii has met every requirement to become a State in the Union; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the veterans of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team, One Hundredth Infantry Battalion, Military Intelligence Service, and the One Thousand Three Hundred and Ninety-ninth Engineers that they hereby endorse and strongly urge the Senate of the United States to grant immediate statehood to Hawaii; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the following:

Hon. Harry S. Truman, President of the United States,

Hon. Alben W. Barkley, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate,

Hon. Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior,

Hon. Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives,

Hon. Joseph C. O'Mahoney, chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the United States Senate, and

Hon. James E. Murray,

Hon. Sheridan Downey,

Hon. Ernest W. McFarland,

Hon. Clinton P. Anderson,

Hon. Edward L. Leahy,

Hon. Hugh Butler,

Hon. Eugene Millikin,

Hon. Glen H. Taylor,

Hon. Guy Cordon,

Hon. Zales N. Ecton,
 Hon. George W. Malone, and
 Hon. Arthur V. Watkins, members of said committee,
 Hon. J. Mardin Peterson, chairman of the Public Lands Committee of the
 United States of House of Representatives,
 Hon. Francis E. Walter, United States House of Representatives,
 Hon. Ingram M. Stainback, Governor of Hawaii,
 Hon. Joseph R. Farrington, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.
 Respectfully submitted.

DANIEL T. AOKI,
President, Four Hundred and Forty-second Veterans Club.
 SAKAE TAKAHASHI,
President, Club 100.
 GEORGE K. HIRONAKA,
President, Military Intelligence Service Linguist Associates.
 TETSUO OZAKI,
President One Thousand Three Hundred Ninety-ninth Engineers.

Mr. FARRINGTON. As I say, this support extends to the commercial and business people, the conservative people of the Territory.

Mr. Chairman, before I proceed further, may I ask that this letter from the school children be incorporated in the record?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the letter will be received.
 (The Mana School letter referred to is as follows:)

MANA SCHOOL, *Kekaha, Kauai, T. H., April 26, 1950.*

HON. JOSEPH FARRINGTON,
Delegate to Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FARRINGTON: We, the eighth graders of Mana School, recently conducted a town hall meeting on the topic, Should Hawaii Be Granted Statehood? We concluded that Hawaii should be granted immediate statehood for the following reasons:

1. We studied the history of the United States and find that self-government is the most valuable heritage and tradition of Americans. Why can't Hawaii be granted this precious right? Unless Hawaii is granted statehood, we shall lose faith in our form of government.

2. We learned that Hawaii is basically sound and secure economically. Hawaii can easily meet the cost of a State government.

3. We enjoy one of the best educational systems in the United States. We are proud of it.

4. By the percentage (79.2 percent) that voted at the final constitution convention election, we know Hawaii has matured politically. Granting statehood to Hawaii will prove to our alien parents that the United States is a true democracy. How can we believe in the honesty and democratic nature of our government unless Hawaii is granted statehood?

5. Hawaii's population has proved its loyalty and Americanization during World War II.

6. Modern means of communication and transportation bring Hawaii to the doorsteps of Washington, D. C.

7. We have no fear of communism. We love the ideals, traditions, and system of free enterprise in America. We want statehood.

We hope that you will be able to use this letter at the Senate hearing on statehood for Hawaii.

Respectfully yours,

CAROLE NAHARA.
 ESTHER KUDAISHI.
 LOURDES ABRAGAR.
 ANTONIO TANGO.
 RICHARD YONAMINE.
 STANLEY YADAO.
 CAROLINA TUMBAGA.
 MAGDALIN LAHEP.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would like to say in conclusion that I think we have established beyond question the proposition that Hawaii was

promised statehood. That promise was implied at least under the terms of annexation. It has been held out to us by innumerable committees of Congress and by the platforms of the political parties. I do not believe anyone can successfully dispute this contention. It is, moreover, basic with us of the Territory of Hawaii.

I think Senator Burke in his testimony pointed out very clearly the legal aspects of this contention. I do not think it is necessary to dwell on it any further as the testimony is already full of arguments and facts which support this point of view.

There has been a great deal of discussion of the contention that statehood for Hawaii might set a precedent that would rise to plague the country in the future, that we of Hawaii being of an insular area should not be admitted to the Union as a State because, if we are admitted to the Union, then Puerto Rico and any number of other insular areas will be asking the same thing. Some of those mentioned are Guam and the Virgin Islands. I think anyone who has been in those areas would readily realize that these areas are not going to apply for statehood. It would be extremely presumptuous even to suggest it. Guam is 200 square miles and has about 75,000 people. Its limitations are such that I do not think it would ever think of asking for statehood. Certainly, no one in Guam has proposed it so far. It would be ridiculous to do so.

It has been pointed out very clearly that Alaska and Hawaii are the last of the incorporated Territories; that the decision as to whether or not we should become States was really made at the time we were incorporated into the Union and made Territories. I do not think that the question before the committee is whether or not this sets a precedent. I think the precedent has been set. The question is whether or not this is the time to fulfill the promise. I think it is. I think that the evidence shows overwhelmingly that we are prepared to assume the responsibilities of statehood.

The most compelling evidence to me of our economic fitness to become a State is what we have contributed to the Federal Treasury. We have undergone a great and unusual development during the course of the last 100 years. We are today a highly developed American community. We are able to manage and take care of our own affairs. There cannot be any question but that we are, economically speaking, in a position to assume the responsibilities of State government.

Some people may argue that we are not prepared from a political, social, moral, or spiritual standpoint. I think all of the facts show that the contrary is the case. The testimony of the president of the University of Hawaii, Dr. Gregg Sinclair, showed that the influence of our cultural and social life has been both very far-reaching and very constructive; that we have made a great contribution to the advancement of the democratic way of life—particularly throughout the Pacific.

I have a feeling that if you continue to deny Hawaii statehood, if you fail to act on this petition, that our great tradition of self-reliance, a tradition which has built an enormous system of irrigation without a cent of cost to the Federal Government and brought into being two great industries and is responsible for our remarkable growth, will begin to deteriorate. I do not think there is the slightest doubt that the refusal of this committee to grant our petition for statehood will

discourage our people and fill them with a certain despair. It will be a source of bitter disappointment.

I think it might even go further than that. It might fill them with a considerable amount of resentment. I want to say that I do not think that resentment is going to be expressed against the United States, nor is it going to impair their loyalty to this country because we know the people of the United States support us in our appeal for statehood.

The evidence at the very outset, of Governor Warren, of the position taken by the governors' conference, and any other bits of evidence show that the United States, the people of this country, favor the admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State at the present time.

So we will find very, very difficult to understand why anyone can continue to oppose our admission to the Union at this time. And there is not a person who came on here from Hawaii who does not believe in his own heart that those members of the Senate who led the fight against statehood are coming around to our point of view. We are so thoroughly convinced that it is sound.

I listened to the testimony on the question of statehood for Alaska and was very much interested in the questions raised by Senator Millikin at its conclusion as to what benefits there were for the United States in admitting Hawaii to the Union as a State. I have given that question a great deal of thought and think the best answer to that is another question and that is: Just what would your answer have been when Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Wyoming, or the other 29 Territories which were admitted to the Union as a State? I do not think our request for statehood presents a case any different in this regard than did that of the admission of these Territories.

We know from our history that the people grow as they are given new and additional responsibilities.

Senator MILLIKIN. Mr. Chairman, I might take the liberty of commenting on what the gentleman has just said. That line of argument would wipe out the relevancy of the inquiry entirely. In other words, anyone coming in here, any applicant coming in here asking for statehood, we could not consider what it might add to the Union because perhaps we did not consider it in such other cases. I suggest it is a very vital question and is entirely relevant. If we were wise or made errors in past decisions, I do not see how that binds the future. It is still, in my mind, the dominant question of what does the applicant add to the strength of the Union. I regard it as important, what the desire of the applicant may be. But it is not determinative, in my mind.

Mr. FARRINGTON. No, but I think on the basis of the experience of the past, we can very readily conclude that as a State, this Territory will be more closely integrated into the life of the country, certainly politically, and that we will have better government.

I think that at that time our responsibilities, respective responsibilities, will be infinitely better defined.

Senator MILLIKIN. I think that can be made an argument to the point that something is added to the strength of the Union under the statement that you have just made. The applicant will get into the swing of things as a member of the Union and as such will add something to the Union.

I think that is a relevant argument to the point which I have raised. I wish we could have some more, though.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes; I am glad that you recognize that point.

Senator MILLIKIN. I do not deny it.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I am not arguing the thing with you. I am trying to satisfy your own mind.

Senator MILLIKIN. Any person brought into the home as a new member of the family has to adjust and conform and ultimately even though the prospects are not encouraging at the time of that person's admission into the family, ultimately that person may become a very valuable member of the family. I do not doubt that. But I would like to see some argument warranting the prediction that the applicant would become a valuable member of the family.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Not on the basis of what has happened in the past but on the inherent record of Hawaii itself.

Senator MILLIKIN. On any basis. I am not suggesting for a moment now how the point should be made. I would not dream of doing that. I am merely stating that personally I am interested in what the applicant adds to the strength of the Union; that is the predominating question in my mind. Maybe I have misjudged what are the determining factors but I would be less than candid if I said that the degree of desire to get into the Union—that that is the determinative factor.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I mention that because I want to amplify that point.

I do not think there is any question but what it will mean better government. The period of tutelage has run its course. We have come to the point of graduation and we are ready to take our own place on a basis of equality. I think that in the field of national government we have a real contribution to make to this country. We of Hawaii have lived for well over 150 years under circumstances that are quite unique. We have lived in the American tradition.

I want to point out that unlike most of the areas of the Pacific, the people of Hawaii have never been subject to a foreign power. They have been raised and nurtured in the tradition of America. The whole cultural, social, religious, economic life has been integrated with America. Now we want to complete that job by integrating us politically with the rest of the country.

When you get up in the morning in Hawaii and you move into the life of the community, you are brought into contact with the people of the Pacific Basin and of Asia. Most of those people are today American citizens. They have lived there for years. We are accustomed to dealing with them. They are part of our life. We like them. We know they have made a great contribution to our country. I do not think the consciousness of that and its real significance is ever going to be brought home until we have the representation in Congress which we feel we are entitled to; and I say that is a great contribution to the United States of America.

I want to say this: That this move to win statehood for Hawaii is attracting a lot more attention throughout the Pacific than it is in the east and certainly than it is in the Atlantic seaboard because all of the people of that area are aware of our feeling that we were promised this status. I think that if we are denied statehood, it will raise some doubts as to whether this country ever intends to carry out its

promise in this respect and naturally suggests that the reason for that is that many of our people are not of European origin. I do not care what interpretation you may put on that. That is the fact of the matter. This thing holds implications that are of enormous importance to the people all the way through the Pacific islands: in the Philippines, Korea, and Japan.

Senator MILLIKIN. Surely, Mr. Farrington, the Filipinos cannot complain of our treatment of the islands?

Mr. FARRINGTON. No, and I offer that, Senator Millikin, as an argument for carrying out the promise in this case.

Senator MILLIKIN. I am suggesting that the Filipinos, the Philippine experience with the United States indicates that we do keep our promise.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I certainly do——

Senator MILLIKIN. It would indicate that we have great respect for the racial situation there and indicates many things that should be a strong card in our hand through the Pacific area. We liberated the Philippines when we thought it was time to do so. The question still remains, I suggest, Is this the time to bring the Territory of Hawaii into the Union? And I have no opinion on that at the present time. I am listening. But I believe we can have misanalogies as well as analogies.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Senator, I am glad you mentioned that because I think that that experience argues for exactly the thing I am contending. The Philippines were given the promise of independence back in the early part of this century at the same time we were given the promise of statehood. They were set upon one course and we were set upon another—I mean, given the promise of statehood.

Senator MILLIKIN. I want to read this whole record on this promise business. I am not suggesting that we have or have not made valid promises. If we have made a promise, of course, we should keep it. But even had we not made a promise, if the admission of Hawaii were demonstrated to add something of great benefit to the Union, I would be in favor of the admission of Hawaii; and if the promise was made, I would like to study very carefully what were the time elements in the promise. I remember party platforms or platform planks promising independence. Many of them are left completely open as to time when that promise should be matured. All that I was trying to say was that the Philippine experience should be a very helpful factor in our relations in the Pacific area and they certainly should not be slighted to the point that the Filipinos should be discontented with us.

I do not know what we could do to please the Filipinos more than we have done unless we walk on water for them.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I want to reply to that by saying that the Filipinos are not discontented, and on the contrary everything you say argues for the affirmative action on this particular issue.

Senator MILLIKIN. I may have misunderstood you. I understood you to say that our action was a subject of great interest to the Filipinos and that the Filipinos might be very unhappy with us and that might carry on into other Asiatic areas if we did or did not do something about Hawaii.

I am simply making the point that the people of the Philippines, all people of the world, have no just ground of complaint against the

United States. They should be out rooting and tooting for us rather than expressing dissatisfaction at what we might do with reference to some other island in the Pacific.

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is exactly what they are doing because the promise in their case was kept.

Senator MILLIKIN. Then we are in agreement that the Filipinos are not discontented.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I did not contend that they are discontented.

Senator MILLIKIN. I may have misunderstood you and I am glad that that is clarified.

Mr. FARRINGTON. But I am coming back to the proposition, Senator, that this issue has implications that are very far-reaching.

Senator MILLIKIN. You ought not to have implications as far as the Filipinos are concerned.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I will say the Filipinos are intensely interested in this.

Senator MILLIKIN. I do not deny that they are.

Mr. FARRINGTON. They fully expect that this country following the pattern of what it did in the case of the Philippines is going to grant Hawaii statehood.

Senator MILLIKIN. I do not deny that. I am simply saying that the Philippines have no just ground of resentment against what the United States might do in some other case.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I agree that they have no grounds for resentment, and on the contrary they are continuously on our side.

Senator MILLIKIN. I am glad of that. We have no difference of opinion on that except I thought that you were giving the impression, at least, that the Filipinos were watching what we were doing here and that they would be greatly discontented if we did not admit Hawaii to statehood.

Mr. FARRINGTON. No; but I will say this to you—

Senator MILLIKIN. That we injured the Philippines? And that that influence would spread to the Orient? I am not prepared to say that would not happen but I say it should not happen under any just appraisal of the situation by the Filipinos.

Mr. FARRINGTON. But do you think—I do think you will agree with me that the position of this country in the Pacific has seriously deteriorated in the last 3 years.

Senator MILLIKIN. I could make a speech lasting 24 hours pointing out the deterioration. They are very alarming to me as they are to anyone else who is aware of the situation.

Mr. FARRINGTON. And I think that the admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State would mark the march back of this country. I want to cite you a personal incident that would be of interest to you.

On an occasion not long ago I asked Senator Taft, of Ohio, who supports statehood for Hawaii just what he thought was his father's greatest contribution to this country, both as President and as the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

Senator MILLIKIN. I would say that his greatest contribution was in fathering Bob Taft.

Mr. FARRINGTON. He may not agree on that; that may be your opinion. I am going to give you Senator Taft's opinion. He said it

was the pattern of government that he established for the Filipinos. He put them on the road to independence.

Now he appreciates, I think, the full implication of this thing from an international standpoint. The wise men who drafted our organic act, and among them was Senator Morgan of Alabama, put us on the road to statehood. Every boy and girl who is raised in Hawaii knows that. They know of the speech Senator Morgan made in the Kawaiahae Church in Honolulu back in 1897, in which he said that when Hawaii became a part of this country a Hawaiian boy might someday be President of the United States.

We have lived in that tradition all these years. Our population, which has been drawn from all parts of the Pacific, has been raised in that tradition. If you sat here and listened to how the Americans of all these strains spoke and felt the spirit of their remarks, you would know how it has taken hold and how the admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State would spark the movement for democracy throughout the Pacific.

Senator MILLIKIN. I said nothing about the spirit and I regret that I missed it; but I assure you I shall give very careful attention to the record and I simply want to say at the present time that I have also been intensely interested in this question but that since January 17, the Senate Committee on Finance has been continuously occupied with social-security matters. I am the ranking Republican member of the committee. It was necessary for me to be there continuously and that is why I have not been here. I want to make it very clear that I did not want to miss a single word of these hearings but I had no alternative but to absent myself. But I shall read the record very carefully.

Mr. FARRINGTON. You understand that I am not criticizing.

Senator BUTLER. I may say that I inserted a statement in the record at the beginning to that effect and again at the close of the hearings.

Senator MILLIKIN. I am very glad that was done because my absence might have been badly misunderstood. After all of the hollering that I have done for having a full hearing on this, not being here, a lot of bad implications might be drawn and I do want the record to be perfectly straight.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Millikin, I think I should say that it was clear to every member of the committee, of course, that your absence was dictated not by any failure to appreciate the importance of the evidence which was being presented here, at either the Alaska statehood hearing or the Hawaii statehood hearing, but heavy responsibilities which have fallen upon you as the ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Finance.

We regretted very much that you were not present and it was made quite clear to all who are in attendance that your absence was in line of duty and not because of any neglect of the important issues involved here.

Senator MILLIKIN. I appreciate the chairman's statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me also add that, as the chairman of the committee, I am very well aware that when the committee in executive session begins to review the problems raised by these two questions, we will have the attendance and the advice and counsel of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I want to say, Senator, that I would not be so presumptive as to be critical in any way. I am aware of all these facts.

Senator MILLIKIN. I do not object to your criticism. I am accustomed to it. I am accustomed to putting it out and the fellow who puts it out has to take it.

Mr. FARRINGTON. We appreciate your presence here and this opportunity to exchange views on this particular issue.

I would like to state that there has been incorporated in this record a brief statement covering some of the points that I have raised, Senator, and on the issue of the advantages to the country admitting Hawaii to the Union as a State.

The CHAIRMAN. Does this summary follow your own views?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes, it formalizes what I have said.

Now, every committee that has investigated this question has come up—that has investigated it since the war—has come up with the recommendation that we be admitted to the Union as a State, except one, and that was the committee of which Senator Butler was the head.

The issues that he raised have been dealt with rather extensively during the course of the hearings. I want to say that we of Hawaii are grateful to Senator Butler for the attention he has given this subject and for his willingness to remain in these hearings.

I believe that we are thoroughly capable of dealing with the problem of communism. I think anyone examining into the life of our community and into the attitudes of their people will agree with me.

At the time of the strike of the longshoremen last year there were many people in Hawaii, among our conservative people particularly who had grave reservations about the question of statehood for Hawaii. They felt it necessary to preserve the territorial form of government and the degree of Federal responsibility that that contemplates in order to deal with just such problems as those presented by this strike.

But do you know that after that strike was over, after that experience, this point of view almost completely evaporated. All of us in Hawaii were made to realize that we had to meet that problem ourselves and the former opponents to whom I just referred were among them. I shouted from one end of this Capital to the other about the importance of Federal intervention but was told on every hand that we would have to deal with this problem ourselves.

I still think the position of the National Government was in error. I do not believe that that problem admits of solution by action in Hawaii alone. It is an extremely vexing and perplexing problem and in its many phases enters into many issues before Congress. I believe it argues for giving us a greater representation in Congress than we have at the present time; also for a vote for President and Vice President.

The record of the legislature which has been presented to the Congress certainly argues eloquently for our readiness to come to grips with this particular problem so far as we can within our limitation. But this is not enough. It is a national problem.

We have in Hawaii an economy that sustains the life of our people on a basis that is slightly above the average of the rest of the country.

This is shown by Federal figures. We have a school system which compares favorably with that of any of the States. We have a community life that is in the American pattern and it has within it all of the patriotic and civic organizations that can be brought into play against the issue of communism. We have a very strong spiritual life. The churches are very strong in the Territory of Hawaii. We have an unusual and extraordinary interest in politics. People are willing and do study the issues that present themselves. Like all other people, we make our mistakes. We may be slow in dealing with certain problems. But I contend that our record through the years, through the last war, shows that we will and we can deal with any problem that arises—that we can and are dealing with the problem of communism among others—and that we can do it more effectively as a State than as a Territory.

To persistently refuse to give us statehood moreover in the face of the record we have made plays right into the hands of the Communists.

Of course the Communists have taken a strong position in favor of statehood. They are back of Abraham Lincoln and the Constitution of the United States. Their policy always is to embrace popular causes. That is their normal and natural strategy. But they have been exposed and the record of what has been done in the last few weeks in Hawaii argues in support of the proposition that as soon as they are exposed, they will be eliminated. I think when you have all of the facts, you will be satisfied. I am sure the Democrats of Hawaii are quite as determined as are all others to rid themselves of Communist influences. It is possible that there are other factors that have brought about the present situation in the Democratic Party of Hawaii. I do not think it is for me to go into that, but I do want to make this statement with regard to communism. Furthermore, communism is a national problem and is generally recognized as such. It has to be dealt with on a national basis.

Mr. Chairman I do not want to prolong this hearing any further, but I do want to conclude with this point. If you do not make us a State at this time, of course we can continue as a Territory. But more than that, you should offer us some alternative. I would say that the fair thing to do with us is to answer this question now. We have made a tremendous effort to cover every point that has been raised. This thing has now been going on for many, many years.

I introduced as one of the witnesses Seth Richardson who went to Hawaii in 1932. I was the young man who wrote the briefs opposing the recommendations of Seth Richardson. All of his recommendations were rejected as a result of this and other factors. I was projected into politics. I ran for election to the Territorial Senate and on a platform calling for Statehood for Hawaii. Statehood was very unpopular with certain people in Hawaii at that time, who contended I could not be elected on that basis. I was elected; however, and by a large vote. This sort of changed the minds of a good many persons concerning this question. I have pursued it ever since, believing it vital to the welfare of Hawaii.

I have devoted an enormous amount of effort to this question because it is a matter of deep conviction with me. But I am not unique in this respect. There are many others who feel exactly the same way as I

do. My predecessor, Sam King, worked for years to advance the cause of statehood. He devoted his major energies to it; when he left Congress he sort of passed the flag to me, like we do in a relay race. These people who have come here from Hawaii for these hearings may disagree violently on other matters, but on this they are completely of the same mind. And with them, with all of us, it is a matter of more than mind; it is a matter of the spirit. It goes to the very heart of our people. In the face of this are you going to say, now, you again wait and wait on this question of statehood? You have been telling us that ever since 1935. I do not think it is sound policy to treat us that way any longer. I think it is going to be bad for the country, bad for Hawaii. It will be infinitely better for you to say to us that you are not going to make us a State because our country is noncontiguous or whatever the reason may be that you have reconsidered all aspects of this question and have decided finally Hawaii should not be admitted. Then, supposing you give us the status of Puerto Rico—let us elect the Governor, choose our judges and credit to our Territory what we pay into the Federal Treasury. We pay into the Federal Treasury almost twice what we spend in the Territorial Government. What a boon that would be to us.

I do not recommend this, but I suggest that alternatives to statehood might be given some consideration. It would change then our case. We have paid more than \$1,000,000,000 into the Federal Treasury. For a small group of people that is pretty good. On an average, our payments into the Treasury as individuals run ahead of those of the individuals of something like 35 or 36 States. We run a good economy. We are smart agriculturalists; we are able businessmen.

Senator McFARLAND. What form of taxes were those, Mr. Farrington?

Mr. FARRINGTON. All Federal taxes. We pay all the taxes that any State does. In Puerto Rico, the tax is paid under the Federal tax system and are credited to the treasury of Puerto Rico.

Senator McFARLAND. Those were not income taxes, then?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes; we pay everything.

Senator McFARLAND. I know you pay the income taxes; but did that include import taxes?

Mr. FARRINGTON. There are no import taxes.

Senator McFARLAND. No customs duties?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Part of that is at the first port of entry; that could be classified directly to Hawaii. But that is negligible in amount. Normally, we pay more into the Treasury than the people in most of the States. Of course, I am not recommending that our Federal taxes be refunded. I think we should be admitted to the Union as a State but I think if you are not going to make us a State, then this proposition deserves consideration.

Senator MILLIKIN. I suggest that it would be an unhappy recommendation because the facts that cause us to refund taxes to Puerto Rico argue against the admission of Puerto Rico as a State.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Of course, there is no question about that. I merely introduced that point because Puerto Rico has been introduced into this discussion and the question has been asked: "Well, suppose

we let you elect your Governor and choose your own judges and run your affairs": the natural thing to supplement that is to revise the application of the tax laws.

Senator MILLIKIN. Has there ever been any move for independence?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Never. I hope there never will be.

Senator BUTLER. We have some letters from Hawaii suggesting that, but I do not know that they will be made a part of the record. There are only a few.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I think they are frivolous or come from crackpots that every community has.

Senator ECTON. Mr. Chairman, I think the pronounced difference between Puerto Rico and Hawaii is that Puerto Rico is not in a position now and never has been in a position to support statehood whereas Hawaii is able financially to do so. I think that is the determining factor between Puerto Rico and Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. There is one point I want to add and that is this: Our life has been revolutionized by air transportation. As all of you know, we have three major airlines from the Pacific coast to Hawaii and two or three running across the Pacific and that has doubled and quadrupled the travel to Hawaii within a matter of a few years. The climate of the Hawaiian Islands which is so attractive to many people is causing many people to buy homes and settle there. I anticipate that there will be a movement to Hawaii and it has already started, of much the same type of people that settled Santa Barbara and Pasadena. They can get home overnight very comfortably, and that is the most important fact of our population. Hawaii would be populated to a large degree and principally in the course of the next few years by people who come in there from the States. We are subject to the same immigration laws as the other States so there is not going to be any movement of people from other parts of the country. Those people that come in from the outside.

The people who work at Pearl Harbor came in during the war and they won't give up residence at home because they don't want to give up their right to vote. They have learned the value of having representation in the Senate.

I talked to a man who came from Speaker Sam Rayburn's district. He came to see me the other day in Honolulu. He has been there since 1937. I asked him, "Did you give up residence in Texas?" He says, "No; I am still a resident legally of Sam Rayburn's district and expect to continue as such. We have in addition a couple of Members of the Senate who vote and I don't want to lose that."

Men such as this give strength to the movement for statehood. They fully understand its value.

I think that concludes my remarks.

Senator MILLIKIN. May I make one interruption?

Has the hearing developed the percentage of those eligible to vote who do vote in your local elections?

Mr. FARRINGTON. We will provide that information, Senator.

(The information requested was subsequently submitted as follows:)

Percentage of registrants voting—general elections

EXHIBIT 13D. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION¹

Year	Number of registrants	Number voting ²	Percent of registrants voting	Year	Number of registrants	Number voting ²	Percent of registrants voting
1900-----	11, 216	9, 589	85. 49	1924-----	34, 739	29, 717	85. 54
1902-----	12, 612	11, 326	89. 80	1926-----	40, 569	34, 532	85. 12
1904-----	13, 253	11, 990	90. 47	1928-----	46, 058	38, 939	84. 54
1906-----	13, 578	12, 430	91. 55	1930-----	52, 149	43, 544	83. 50
1908-----	13, 274	12, 316	92. 78	1932-----	63, 831	57, 651	90. 32
1910-----	14, 442	13, 541	93. 76	1934-----	71, 168	62, 427	87. 72
1912-----	15, 185	13, 340	87. 85	1936-----	75, 059	64, 184	85. 51
1914-----	17, 699	11, 809	66. 72	1938-----	83, 312	73, 182	87. 84
1916-----	18, 981	13, 339	70. 28	1940-----	87, 312	74, 538	83. 37
1918-----	20, 124	13, 375	66. 46	1942-----	85, 292	63, 359	74. 28
1920-----	26, 335	22, 336	84. 81	1944-----	84, 326	71, 704	85. 03
1922 (S)-----	28, 806	24, 213	84. 06	1946 ³ -----	103, 180	82, 974	80. 4
1922-----	32, 491	25, 972	79. 94	1948-----	123, 616	107, 529	86. 9

¹ Statehood for Hawaii, hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Territories, House of Representatives, 79th Cong., 2d sess., Pursuant to H. Res. 236 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1946) p. 722.

² Votes received for delegate only, 1900 to 1928, inclusive.

³ 1946 and 1948 figures from official tabulation of votes cast for delegate.

Mr. FARRINGTON. It is exceptionally high.

Senator MILLIKIN. Most any figure you could produce would be better than the general national average of the United States.

Mr. FARRINGTON. It runs normally 85 or 86 percent.

Senator MILLIKIN. Senator Truman was elected by 26 percent of the eligible voters.

Mr. FARRINGTON. But the interest in civic affairs and in politics is very extraordinary. Of course, this fight for statehood had stimulated it enormously and people go to the meetings by the hundreds and thousands and they will listen to you for hours if you talk about the facts of government.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that just about concludes my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions?

Senator BUTLER. The delegate referred to the matter that I brought up yesterday morning but said that on account of him being a member of the opposite party he did not think it was up to him to make a report on the Democratic Territorial convention that was held there last Sunday. But the Democratic national committeemen and national committeewoman, I think, are in the city. I had hoped that they would be presented so as to give their side of the story.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Well, I think they are going to cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior in rounding out this story, Senator.

Senator BUTLER. We will hear from them indirectly through the Secretary?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I want to say that your request for a report has been very strongly emphasized by myself in my talks with all the Democrats. I told them they should answer it. I might give a Republican interpretation of that thing and that might be regarded as prejudiced.

Senator McFARLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like for the record to show that the reason I have not been able to attend these hearings on Hawaii and Alaska more than I have was because I was chairman of

the subcommittee holding hearings on another matter. I am very much interested in it and there were some questions I would like to ask, but I am sure they have already been answered in the hearings.

Senator BUTLER. I think we covered everything.

Senator MCFARLAND. I think there are some things that from my short observation in Hawaii that people have solved a little bit better than we have ourselves, but there were some other questions that I would have asked that I am sure have been answered.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Senator, if you want to submit those questions to us, we will have the answers provided.

Senator MCFARLAND. I am sure you have covered the whole field.

The thing that I was interested in largely was in regard to this public land thing. As I stated at the hearings on the Alaska statehood, if Alaska is to be a State, I would like to see her not be saddled with some of the things that the other States were saddled with; some of the handicaps. But I will look at the record.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I will ask Senator Burke.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we have a pretty full record.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Senator, we have the amendments that we want to make to the bill. I do not know whether or not you want those presented at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. They should be presented, of course. Did you discuss at any time the amendments suggested by Judge Maris with respect to the United States courts? I put his letter in the record on the opening day.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Only generally. We approved those amendments.

FURTHER STATEMENT OF EDWARD R. BURKE, ESQ., LEGAL ADVISER, HAWAII STATEHOOD COMMISSION

Mr. BURKE. May I say a word about amendments? There are three major amendments that have been discussed in the hearings. The first amends or is the judiciary section of H. R. 49 which Judge Maris examined thoroughly and submitted the amendment. The Secretary of the Interior proposed the definite amendments and submitted them to the committee. The statehood commission and all advocates of statehood heartily endorse all that has been said about it. It is fully explained in the record that is before the committee and I think it is unnecessary to say anything further about that.

The other major amendment deals with the fact that H. R. 49, that after H. R. 49 was drafted and submitted to the House, but before its passage, there were changes in the precincts and other arrangements whereby delegates to the constitutional convention are called and then the Territorial legislature decided to go ahead and call a convention so an amendment has been offered on that which is noncontroversial and the full argument is in the record.

The third major amendment, one dealing with Hawaii, the Hawaii Homes Commission which was organized both ways yesterday, and there is nothing further to be said about that.

In addition to that, there are a number of what we call, I think properly call, clarifying amendments. Some are of some importance, but I think there is nothing about which any evidence was needed to be introduced, either for or against, if anybody were against them.

It is a matter for the drafting service to take up. They are really in the line of clarifying amendments, it seemed to me, and it would be much better rather than to take the time of the committee to go in—I have them here—with an explanation of each, but if the committee staff, the legislative counsel of the committee, could sit down—these have been worked out with the Solicitor's Department of the Interior Department, with Miss Rhoda Lewis, Assistant Attorney General, and myself as attorney for the Statehood Commission, if we could sit down either with the committee or subcommittee of this committee in executive session, or preferably with Mr. —

The CHAIRMAN. To what subjects do these amendments relate?

Mr. BURKE. Let me take the first one to explain the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they amendments of substance or amendments of form?

Mr. BURKE. They are largely amendments of form and clarification, although some of them I would not want to say are not of real importance. But I think they are not what you would call amendments of substance.

The CHAIRMAN. May I say, speaking generally about this problem of statehood, that I have received an impression that conflicting forces are reshaping our concept of State government. The passage of time and the developments of science in the years since the Constitution of the United States was first adopted have certainly brought about great changes in the functioning of State governments. When the Constitution of the United States was drafted, the States as local sovereignties had the major responsibility for the economic and political organizations of the people within their boundaries. The Federal Government had a much smaller impact upon the individual lives of the people. The Federal Government in those days was largely a government of international relations and of interstate and foreign commerce, so that Congress was not called upon to legislate in the local field.

Now Congress is being constantly called upon to legislate in the local field. The fact that so many members of this committee were prevented from being present was because of attendance on other committee sessions required by the growing responsibilities of the National Government. Senator McFarland was attending a most important meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce having to do with the transmission, throughout the United States and elsewhere within our jurisdiction, of information that is used in local communities and which is alleged by many people to be the basis of a national crime syndicate that is involved in offenses which historically were cognizable only by State authority.

Senator McFARLAND. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that fortunately there was not any evidence in regard to that extending into Hawaii or Alaska.

The CHAIRMAN. Very good. On the other hand, I want to call attention to the activities of the Committee on Finance. That committee was struggling with the problem of Social Security Act amendments under which the Federal Government is to provide extended and broadened coverage for individuals living in the States and in Territories. It is apparent from even these few examples that States which apply for admission to the Union now are applying under conditions which are vastly different from those which existed at the time when the original Territories became States.

We are dealing with this subject in full knowledge and awareness of the fact that world affairs are having a much greater effect upon local affairs than they ever had in years past. I want to say to Delegate Farrington and those who have presented the case on behalf of the statehood that from the very outset I have been deeply impressed by the application of the traditional American social and economic principles in Hawaii. Only a few years ago, I attended the original statehood hearings held in Hawaii in 1937, when great fears were expressed with respect to the Japanese segment of the population. Questions were also raised about the future position of the native Hawaiians.

That brings to my mind the fact that Hawaii was at one time an independent sovereignty of the Hawaiian people. It was brought into the United States not because of the desire of the Hawaiian people, but rather because those who went to Hawaii and established new industry there—particularly the sugar-industry people—were anxious for Hawaii to become a Territory of the United States in order to avoid the tariff wall which existed at that time. The independent government of the Hawaiians was overthrown by the newcomers to Hawaii, and the Republic was established in order to bring about annexation to the United States. But Hawaii has become the center to which thousands of people from all over the Pacific area have been drawn. There can be no doubt in the mind of anybody who is acquainted with what is going on there that Hawaii has become a center for the dissemination of American principles of government and American principles of economic welfare.

I intended to ask Delegate Farrington whether those problems of contract labor have been solved in Hawaii, on which so much emphasis was placed in earlier hearings.

Mr. FARRINGTON. The last of that group of that type of labor to be imported—the last importation of that character took place before the independence of the Philippines and under the provision of the Tydings-McDuffy law some 6,000 Filipinos were imported. The law under which they were imported has since expired, and many of them are now being returned to the Philippines. I do not anticipate that at any time during the future the Territory will go beyond the borders of the country for labor. Of course, they were not contract labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The statistics here would seem to indicate that there has been increased immigration from the Philippines and that the Filipino increase of population represents the only substantial increase of alien inhabitants of Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is correct. That came about as a result of labor shortages created by the war, and it is one of the factors which contributed to the unemployment situation and one means they are using to correct it is transporting them back to the Philippines.

The CHAIRMAN. Another great question, clearly recognized in the presentation of the testimony here is that of Communist infiltration. Communists have apparently infiltrated into the democratic political organization. It has been said that at least one such person was elected to the constitutional convention and expelled. I have no doubt that the members of this committee will desire to give that question the very deepest consideration and the very closest scrutiny. I think it only proper to say that for my own part it seems to me that we shall

be confronted here with the same question that we will have to face on the world stage: Whether or not communism can best be fought by thoroughgoing application of American principles of human brotherhood or by reliance to force and to isolation.

I can never forget, particularly in dealing with the problem of statehood, the preamble of the Constitution of the United States. It seems to me that the purpose there expressed must be considered in all of these matters. Every school child, I think, should know that preamble and probably does. Leaders in Government and in business should apply it, particularly in this time of international crisis.

In my judgment, another war would leave very little possibility of realizing that great American ideal. The preamble of the Constitution revolves around the development of human resources, as it says: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, to establish justice"—justice among people, of course—"to insure tranquility"—for the people, of course—"to provide for the common defense"—the defense of all of the people—"to promote the general welfare"—and that is to say the welfare of people whoever they are and wherever they may be—"and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution." I cannot escape the conclusion that by adhering to those ideals of human progress, we can do more to stop the infiltration of communism than by any other method. It requires courage and vision and foresight to proceed along those lines, but the alternatives of which we speak now, it seems to me, are these:

It is the alternative between remaining loyal to the objectives of the Constitution of the United States as summarized in that preamble, or drifting through isolationism and force into a world war which can only result in setting civilization back I do not know how many centuries.

I have been very much impressed by what you say, by the testimony which has been presented here. I am concerned basically with what Hawaii or Alaska or any other area may do to combat the cause of communism, which is the growth of the proletariat, namely, a population which, though it may be politically free, is not economically free, but is dependent on sources outside of itself for the means of making a living. That is why the economic basis of statehood is of such tremendous importance. That is why I have been asking you the questions about contract labor and about unemployment and whether or not we shall in Hawaii be able to provide the employment which the population needs to maintain its economic independence.

I did not intend to give so much time to this comment but I felt it important to point to the considerations which inevitably will be before the committee in passing upon the problems here. That is why I would like to know from you, Senator Burke, about the amendments of substance which you have to present to us.

MR. BURKE. What the chairman has just said is such an eloquent note to close these hearings on that I would be most reluctant to mention these little clarifying amendments.

I hope the committee will agree that we can take these up; for instance I will give this as an example. H. R. 49 refers in a number of places to Executive orders. The question has been raised whether that term itself would cover proclamations. To my mind "Executive orders" is broad enough, but the question was raised.

We would like to sit down with someone—certainly there is no evidence to be offered on it particularly; it is a matter for the lawyers to discuss and decide.

Mr. FARRINGTON. In what regard, Senator Burke?

Mr. BURKE. These have to do with setting aside of public lands and so forth, by Executive order.

Senator McFARLAND. This is the thing in which I am very much interested. I do not want to take the time because I know you have gone into it. But I want to say this, Mr. Farrington, right now you have a sympathetic committee here in regard to the public-land questions. Some of us have had to deal with it in our States and I would not want to see you come in under the same handicap that we did.

Mr. BURKE. The record is very clear on that, Senator McFarland, and that is a matter of defining terms.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Burke, if you will offer those amendments so that they may be in the record, then I will ask you to sit down with Mr. French of our staff and go over them. If it should be necessary in the meantime, prior to our executive session upon the matter, I shall ask Senator McFarland to act as chairman of a subcommittee to consult you, Senator Burke, and any others that you may designate with respect to the details of the amendment.

Mr. BURKE. I think that is very satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has a statement of John C. Williamson which, it is indicated to the chairman, it was desired to offer for inclusion in the record. I understand that Mr. Williamson has not testified heretofore.

The Chair is also in receipt of numerous letters from people opposing statehood. Some of these letters are clearly not intended for inclusion in the record. I may say that that becomes self evident from a reading of the letters because the authors in each case to which I am now referring state that the opponents of statehood are fearful of expressing a position because of the fear of reprisals that might be invited. So of course I do not want to put such letters in the record.

I have, however, a letter from Mr. Edward R. Lewis, of Winnetka, Ill., and a letter from John A. Hoopale, Hualaloa Beach, both opponents of the statehood, which will be made part of the record.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 49, 81ST CONGRESS, AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Suggested by the Hawaii Statehood Commission)

1. Page 8, line 10, after the word "State" and before the period add the following "and all debts owed to said Territory of Hawaii shall be collected by said State".

This proposed amendment would incorporate in the bill standard provisions, similar to those found in the enabling acts of States heretofore admitted, to assure that the State of Hawaii is the successor to all debts owed to the Territory.

2. A. Page 8, line 12, strike out the words "Executive order" and insert in lieu thereof "Act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation".

B. Page 9, line 1, strike out the words "Executive order" and insert in lieu thereof "Act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation".

C. Page 11, line 2, strike out the words "Executive order" and insert in lieu thereof "Act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation".

D. Page 12, lines 2 and 3, strike out the words "Executive order" at the end of line 2 and the beginning of line 3 and insert in lieu thereof "Act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation".

The bill now refers to Executive orders of the President or the Governor or Hawaii, setting aside lands for the use of the United States, or the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof. The word "proclamation" is added as having the same effect, and reference also is made to acts of Congress setting aside lands.

3. A. Page 8, line 22, strike out the words "are now" and insert in lieu thereof a comma followed by the words "immediately prior to the admission of said State, are".

B. Page 8, line 23, insert after the word "military" the following: "air,".

This proposed amendment includes Air Force with military, naval, and Coast Guard purposes, and provides that the date of admission of the State of Hawaii, not the date of enactment of H. R. 49, will be determinative of the tracts of land over which the United States assumes exclusive legislative jurisdiction by reason of their being held for such purposes.

4. Page 9, lines 9 to 11, change the semicolon in line 9 to a comma, strike out the language following the semicolon which now reads "and the legislative assembly is authorized and directed to enact any law necessary or proper to give effect to this article", and insert in lieu thereof: "and shall have the right to tax persons and corporations, their franchises and property, within the said tracts or parcels of land; and that persons now or hereafter residing on the said tracts or parcels of land shall not be deprived thereby of the right to vote at all elections held within the political subdivisions where they respectively reside."

This proposed amendment conforms the provisions of the bill as to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States over lands held for military, air, naval, or Coast Guard purposes to the provisions of section 16 relating to exclusive jurisdiction over the Hawaii National Park, by including customary saving clauses reserving the State's right to tax and preserving the voting rights of the inhabitants.

5. A. Page 9, line 23, insert a comma after the word "constitution", followed by the words "or in ordinances of the constitutional convention,".

B. Page 10, line 1, insert a comma after the word "fund", being the first word in line 1, and add after the comma the following: "the Hawaiian home-operating fund,".

C. Page 10, line 8, insert a comma after the word "constitution", followed by the words "or in ordinances of the constitutional convention,".

D. Page 10, line 9, insert a comma after the word "legislation" in line 9.

This concerns a requirement that the constitution of the new state shall set forth a compact with the United States relating to perpetuation of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920. Such compact, while in general requiring the consent of Congress for amendments of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, permits certain types of amendments to be made in the original constitution or by state legislation, and the proposed amendment adds ordinances of the convention as another means of legislation. The proposed amendment also conforms the bill to recent amendments of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, creating a new "Home-operating fund" (62 Stat. 390, 48 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sup. III, sec. 707 (d)).

6. A. Page 10, line 25, insert between the words "That" and "any", the words "as to".

B. Page 11, lines 6 and 7, strike out the words "shall be and become the property of the United States absolutely or subject to such limitations", and insert in lieu thereof "the United States shall be and become vested with absolute title thereto, or an interest therein conformable to such limitations,".

C. Page 12, line 1, insert between the words "That" and "any" the words "as to".

D. Page 12, lines 8 to 10, strike out all that follows the comma in line 8, beginning with the word "shall", and all of lines 9 and 10, and insert in lieu thereof: "the United States or the State of Hawaii, or subject to the constitution and laws of said State, such political subdivision, as the case may be, shall retain or become vested with absolute title thereto, or an interest therein conformable to such limitations, as the".

These are perfecting amendments.

7. Page 11, line 18, strike all of line 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and of the Committee on Public Lands of the".

This is a perfecting amendment.

8. Page 11, line 20, insert after the word "Hawaii", preceding the comma, the following: "and the terms and provisions of the cession and transfer thereof by the Republic of Hawaii".

This proposed amendment is for the purpose of specifically stating the intent of the bill that the contentions of the people of Hawaii relating to the status of the public lands and other property in Hawaii, based on the terms and provisions of the cession and transfer made by the Republic of Hawaii, are deferred for hearing before the joint congressional committee provided for by the bill.

9. Page 12, line 11, change the period to a colon and add after the colon the following: "*Provided, further,* That the provisions of section 91 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 511), which authorize the President to restore to their previous status lands set aside for the use of the United States, shall not terminate upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union but shall continue in effect until the end of said five-year period."

The purpose is to make it clear that during the 5-year period of the joint congressional committee investigation the President may continue to restore to its previous status land which the President shall find no longer required for Federal use. The land so restored could be selected by the State of Hawaii and title thereto thus obtained.

10. Page 12, lines 16 to 18, delete the comma in line 16, and the remainder of the sentence following the word "land" in line 16 and ending with the word "State" in line 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and other public property within the boundaries of said State except Hawaiian home lands, and also excepting the property and interests therein set aside for the use of the United States prior to the admission of said State, if not restored to their previous status within the period of five years after the enactment of this Act."

This conforms to other provisions of the bill, as proposed to be amended, the designation of the property from which the new state may make its selection of 180,000 acres, so as to permit selection from the residue not in use by the United States or covered by the compact relating to the Hawaiian Home Lands.

11. Page 12, line 25, delete "patended" and insert in lieu thereof the word "patented".

This proposed amendment is to correct a typographical error.

12. Page 13, line 8, delete the word "and", change the period after the word "improvements" to a comma, and insert after the comma the following: "and for the provision of lands for public use."

The purpose of this amendment is to permit lands to be set aside for any public use.

13. Page 14, lines 20 to 24, strike out the last five words in line 20, commencing with the word "with", and all of lines 21 to 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "with the clerks of the several counties, shall constitute a canvassing board and they, or any three of them, shall meet at the city of Honolulu, not later than the third Monday after said election, and shall canvass the same."

This relieves the Governor and chief justice of the duty of serving as a canvassing board, substituting the clerks of the several counties, and permits the canvassing board to meet earlier than the specified third Monday after the ratification election.

STATEMENT OF JOHN C. WILLIAMSON, ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for this opportunity of presenting the views of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in regard to the bill H. R. 49, which, if enacted, would admit Hawaii into the Union as a State.

The golden jubilee national convention of the VFW meeting in Miami, Fla., in August 1949 adopted a resolution by unanimous vote of the delegates present that Hawaii be admitted to statehood. A cross-section of America, representatives of every State in the Union and all walks of life, thus expressed themselves that the time had now come that Hawaii should and ought to share equally with other States in full and complete participation in the democratic framework of this Nation.

I am here, therefore, to plead the cause of statehood for Hawaii in accordance with this convention mandate.

The statehood for Hawaii issue has been before the Congress for more than 30 years. Time and time again the citizens of Hawaii have stood at the threshold of statehood only to be thwarted by delay—by vague generalities that Hawaii was not ready, its people politically immature, it was not contiguous to the United States, or because of the menace of communism.

These arguments have been answered repeatedly and have been found to be little more than the vague manifestations of a concept that would deny to the United States her complete and rightful role as a democracy in which there is but one type of citizenship.

For example, consider the issue of communism which was raised in 1948. Give the people of Hawaii an opportunity to share in the main currents of American life—give them the green light of equal partnership in the shaping of the economic and political structure of the United States and you strike a telling blow against communism and every other ism except Americanism. Communism breeds in inequality and injustice. Admit Hawaii to statehood and deprive communism of one of its most telling arguments.

Hawaii is a typical American community. Its approximately 550,000 people, 86 percent of whom are citizens, have proven their readiness for statehood. Their record in World War II will stand the most critical analysis. Hawaii is a cross-roads in the Pacific in a generation of increasing concern for our relations with other nations bordering on the Pacific. Be assured that the millions of people living on the western rim of the Pacific are watching this action for statehood. Approval will signify more than anything we have done in the past that the United States practices what it preaches.

In closing I can think of nothing more eloquent than to repeat the question put to me by the delegate of the Hawaiian Department to the Fiftieth National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, "What more can Hawaii do?"

WINNETKA, ILL., March 24, 1950.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,

Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I write this letter in opposition to the proposal to admit Hawaii to statehood.

To my mind, there are four controlling reasons why Hawaii should not be admitted to statehood:

- (1) The distance of Hawaii from this continent.
- (2) The danger from Communist infiltration.
- (3) The woeful mixture of the population of Hawaii, of races of different color and backgrounds, rendering the operation of a successful democracy an arduous if not an impossible task.
- (4) The history of Hawaii in dealing with immigration of people of diverse races, which shows a complete failure to understand the very basis of successful democracies.

I shall take up these points in turn:

(1) *The distance of Hawaii from this continent.*—The late Nicholas Murray Butler, for 46 years president of Columbia University, several times pointed out, in this old age and total blindness, with eloquence and force, that Hawaii is 2,000 miles from the nearest State on the Pacific coast, and, as he said, "in population, in language, and in economic life it is distinctly a foreign land," with a background wholly different from that of the 48 States of the United States. He solemnly declared that the admission of Hawaii as a State "might easily be the first step in bringing to an end the United States of America as established by the founding fathers and as we have known it."¹

I think his moving words should be heeded. Hawaiian people are out of touch with our problems and with our public opinion. As will be shown below, this lack of touch with American opinion has been glaringly manifested on the question of the immigration of people of different races and colors.

It is a fair conclusion that if admitted as a State, Hawaiian people could not possibly enter into our national life in the way the people of our 48 States now do. If admitted, Hawaii would always be a State apart, whose people would not understand our problems, and whose problems we would not understand.

¹ New York Herald Tribune, August 25, 1947.

(2) *The danger from Communist infiltration.*—Senator Hugh Butler, of Nebraska, went into this question very thoroughly and ably in his speech in the Senate on May 20, 1948, in which he asked for delay until the extent and danger from Communist infiltration could be investigated and ascertained. He presented some ominous evidence at that time. Among other testimony he presented, was a statement from Territorial Senator William H. Hill, that his main reason for opposing statehood at this time, "is this ILWU and Communist situation that is here." Senator Hill added that he appreciated that "every State has a certain amount, but they do not control as they do here."

The population of Hawaii is so mixed and heterogeneous in its racial make-up that it is fertile ground for Communist agitation. A heterogeneous people, part white, part Chinese, part Japanese, part-native Hawaiian, part Filipino, cannot possibly have the common understanding, the mutual good will which come from common standards and backgrounds, which among a homogeneous people make difficult the spreading of jealousy and suspicion and prejudices.

It cannot be replied that a crisis has not yet developed from Communist infiltration. Last year's long-continued longshoremen's strike was a crisis in itself. A greater crisis could arise at any time.

(3) *The handicap and danger to democracy arising from a population of many different races.*—The vicious Nazi doctrine of racism, the terrible concentration camps, tortures and persecution of minority groups, have so shocked us that many earnest people have revolted in loathing to a feeling that any consideration of race in our political questions is a denial of the "four freedoms." But because we hate Nazi persecution on account of race, does not mean that we should allow new situations to arise which will inevitably breed racial discord and quarrels and make the operation of a happy democracy vastly more difficult. The words of Lincoln in 1858 are strikingly in point here. He said, "I protest now and forever, against that counterfeit logic which presumes that because I do not want a Negro woman for a slave, I do necessarily want her for a wife."

So now, I suggest that we should protest against the equally counterfeit logic which presumes, because we hate the odious Nazi doctrine of racism, with tortures and concentration camps, that, no matter what the disastrous effects on our democracy may be, we should say that no consideration should be given to differences in race or color in immigration questions or in the Hawaiian statehood question.

The 1940 census gives the population of Hawaii as follows:

Hawaiian-----	14, 375	Japanese-----	157, 905
Part-Hawaiian-----	49, 935	Other -----	15, 801
Caucasian-----	103, 791		
Chinese-----	28, 774	Total-----	423, 330
Filipino-----	52, 569		

White people were only 24 percent of the total. No one race had anything approaching a majority.

The Board of Health of the Territory of Hawaii gives the total population of Hawaii on July 1, 1946, as 519,303, of whom it estimated 173,535 were Caucasian, or 33 percent.

I know of no country with a mixture of large numbers of people of different races of different colors, with no one race in the majority, where self-government has been successfully carried on. Self-government is a difficult achievement even under the most favorable conditions. It is a rare achievement. At least three-fourths of the people of the globe have never made a success in governing themselves. No country in South or Central America, or indeed in central or southern Europe, no country in Asia, no country in Africa, save the Union of South Africa, has made a success of self-government. The countries of Central and South America, where racial mixtures much like that of Hawaii exist, have been tragic examples of alternate revolutions and dictatorships.

There is no reason to believe that the woefully mixed population of Hawaii can repeal all the experience of history.

Anyone with any imagination and any knowledge of how big city politics are carried on in the United States, can easily imagine a future Hawaiian politician, if Hawaii is granted statehood, going to the Japanese people of Hawaii and telling them that they are the best people in Hawaii and that the people of other races are mistreating them, telling the Chinese the same thing, telling the Filipinos that both the whites and the Japanese are discriminating against the little brown brother, telling the native Hawaiians and the Part-Hawaiians that they are the only real Hawaiian people, and telling the Japanese, the

Chinese, Filipinos and native Hawaiians all alike, that the wicked and arrogant white race is trying to dominate over them all and deny them equal rights.

We are told that nothing like this has happened in Hawaii, but all political experience warns us that Hawaii, with its large numbers of diverse races, cannot possibly be immune from such demagoguery in the future.

Advocates of Hawaiian statehood dwell much on the record of Nisei troops in the Second World War. I should be the last to minimize their achievements. But it must be remembered that the record of Nisei soldiers in battle tells us nothing of the capacity of the Japanese civilian population for the task of self-government. Self-government, where people vote for candidates, is a very different thing from an army where they act under orders. A fighting record tells us nothing of the political capacity even of those who fought, and nothing at all, of course, of the political capacity of the civilian population. The crucial fact, is that none of Hawaii's Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos or native Hawaiians have had that long experience in self-government which is necessary for a democracy.

But the crucial weakness of Hawaii is the grievous mixture of people of different races who cannot possibly understand each other as the people of a successful democracy understand each other.

It would be folly to ignore some aspects of the history of the Second World War which the advocates of Hawaiian statehood do not talk about. In *Hirabayashi v. U. S.* (320 U. S. 81), the United States Supreme Court upheld the validity of the relocation centers for Japanese residents of the Pacific coast in the Second World War. While the case concerned the Japanese on the west coast, much said in the opinion is applicable to the question of the Japanese in Hawaii. Chief Justice Stone, writing the opinion, stated forcefully that "there is support for the view that social, economic, and political conditions which have prevailed since the close of the last century, when the Japanese began to come to this country in large numbers, have intensified their solidarity, and have in large measure prevented their assimilation as an integral part of the white population." He referred to the large number of children of Japanese parents sent to Japanese language schools, and noted that considerable numbers, "estimated to be approximately 10,000 of American-born children, of Japanese parentage, have been sent to Japan for all or a part of their education." Japan maintained the doctrine of dual citizenship and children born in the United States of Japanese parents, were, he said, in many cases deemed to be Japanese citizens.

Most ominous of all, he asserted that—

Espionage by persons in sympathy with the Japanese Government had been found to have been particularly effective in the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor.

In a book by Andrew W. Lind of the University of Hawaii, entitled "Hawaii's Japanese", which is distinctly friendly to the Japanese in Hawaii, Mr. Lind refers to the 21,000 of second generation of Japanese of draft age who failed to enlist, the 1,200 investigated and interned for the duration of the war, and the large number who at first refused to believe the news of Japan's surrender and have since given support to underground movements of pro-Japanese propaganda.

The naïveté of Americans who imagine that the lessons of self-government can be learned in a few months in the schoolroom, and that the oriental inheritance can be erased in a few years, is a naïveté that can be fatal to a democracy.

(4) *The history of immigration in Hawaii.*—Nothing shows more glaringly the isolation of the people of Hawaii from the currents of public opinion in the United States than their attitude toward immigration of people of different races and colors. The article on Hawaii in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (vol. 11, p. 264, 1946 ed.) is a sorry, if not sordid, story of the importation of one wave of unskilled labor after another. Race or color made no difference. Evidently, what the sugar planters of Hawaii wanted was "hands" for their sugar plantations, not citizens for Hawaii. Apparently they were oblivious or contemptuous of the danger of creating new race problems. On page 269, the above article states that Chinese immigration became so heavy that restrictive measures were applied in 1883, 15 years before annexation to the United States. Then, it is stated, "attention was turned to the Japanese." The Japanese "came in large numbers, at first assisted, then unassisted * * *"

The article then states that opposition on the mainland led to Japanese exclusion in 1924. That was when the Immigration Act of 1924 was enacted.

Yet comparatively small numbers of Chinese and Japanese continued to come into Hawaii for many years after oriental exclusion went into effect.

From 1907 to 1924, when the Immigration Act of 1924 was enacted, the famous gentleman's agreement made by President Theodore Roosevelt, later approved by Congress and given the force of law, provided that Japan would issue no

passports to Japanese laborers to come to continental United States. But they were still permitted to come to Hawaii. The result is that great numbers of Japanese came to Hawaii from 1907 to 1924 who were barred as immigrants to the United States. But it was held in one case that a Japanese who came to Hawaii in 1907 and then went to San Francisco, was not eligible as an immigrant to continental United States. He was denied entrance (*Kaichiro Sugimoto v. Nagle*, 38 Fed. (2) 207, certiorari denied by the United States Supreme Court, 281 U. S. 745).

In short all the Chinese who came to Hawaii after 1898 and all the Japanese who came to Hawaii after the gentleman's agreement of 1907 were ineligible to enter the United States and they are still ineligible. Moreover the children of illegal entrants cannot be considered native-born citizens of the United States.

It will be seen what a mess the Hawaiian situation is. After Japanese immigration was prohibited, the sugar companies in Hawaii turned to Filipino labor. The Encyclopedia Britannica article says, "Finally, largely because of the enactment of Federal laws prohibiting assisted immigration from foreign countries, the sugar countries turned to Filipinos as the only available source * * *." Surely, this is a damning sentence.

Apparently, the native population of whatever race was never a reliable source, and so plantation labor had to be brought in on "the hoof."

The sugar companies seemed to have thought that the Philippines were part of the United States and that consequently it was permissible to bring in contract labor from the Philippines, a possession of the United States, although it was forbidden to bring in contract labor from Europe or Asia.

But our Federal circuit courts of appeal have held for more than 30 years that for immigration purposes, the Philippines must be treated as a foreign country. The act of 1934, providing for Philippine independence in 1946, definitely declared that for immigration purposes, the Philippines should be regarded as a foreign country and its people "considered as if they were aliens." This interpretation was enforced in *Gancy v. U. S.* (149 Fed. (2) 798).

The Philippines became independent on July 4, 1946. From then on, even the man on the street could see that it was a foreign country, as it had been for immigration purposes for many years.

Yet, the report of the Governor of Hawaii to the Secretary of the Interior for 1947 states on page 8, "Due to the Filipino immigrant laborers who arrived in 1947, the Filipino alien group was the only one to increase since 1940."

Moreover, the Filipinos are of the brown race, and members of the brown race are ineligible as immigrants.

It is a mild statement that the record of the Hawaiian people on immigration is a sad and sordid story, a record full of violation of the prohibition of immigration of people of the brown race and of the contract labor law. Yet, to grant statehood to Hawaii would be in effect to admit to the United States as immigrants all the Japanese and Filipinos who were not eligible to enter the United States when they entered Hawaii and are not eligible now.

The Hawaiian situation is a mess whatever way you look at it. It is the product of a cold, selfish labor policy. The result is a witch's caldron. If statehood should be granted Hawaii, I venture to predict that the responsible people of Hawaii will live to rue the day. Statehood for Hawaii should be defeated. To grant it would be a catastrophe to our country.

I am a member of the American, Illinois, and Chicago Bar Associations.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD R. LEWIS.

HOLUALOA BEACH, March 7, 1950.

Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Since 1937 I have opposed the granting of statehood for Hawaii for the reason you already know, which I may again remind you because this Territory is economically, socially, and politically dominated by the big interests. Until this control is somewhat reduced comparable with the principles of democracy, then and there only will we consider statehood for Hawaii.

I wish to call your attention and the honorable members of your committee who will consider this most vital question of Hawaii to remember that these islands were not voluntarily annexed to the United States of America, but was forced by the descendants of the missionaries with the help of their immigrants. The petition of our beloved Queen Liliuokalani and her subjects is still before the people of the United States of America since the day of President Cleveland

to restore the independence of the Hawaiian Islands. Therefore, if the American people, through the mandate of the Congress of the United States seems appropriate at this time to change our present form of government in Hawaii, then may I suggest that the Congress of the United States of America and the President of the United States, by the recommendation of your honorable committee to fulfill the kindly prayer and petition of our late beloved Queen Liliuokalani to restore the independence of our beloved land.

You have given the Filipinos their independence which cost the Americans \$20,000,000 plus the lives of their citizens, but for Hawaii you have not spent one red penny or lost any lives—simply agreed to the protection of the continental United States. In closing may I suggest, if the Congress of the United States wishes to change our present form of government, may I ask that the prayers of our late Queen Liliuokalani be granted.

I sincerely oppose the granting of statehood for Hawaii at this time until the economical control of this Territory is divided equally between the capitalists and the people.

Trusting that your honorable committee will consider my appeal in the best interests of our people, the native Hawaiians, and our beloved land.

Aloha nui loa and

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. HOOPALE.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Butler, is there anything else you would like to offer or say at this time?

Senator BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I have reams of letters pro and con and frankly I have not had time to sift through them. I do not care to insert many of them. There may be a few that I think should be inserted in the record. I would like to have permission to insert them in the next day or two if I can get the staff busy and look through the file and select them.

I have a statement here that came in just this week from a Mr. Arthur M. Churchill, of Portland. He is an acquaintance, if not a friend, and I think he is a friend of both Senators Cordon and Morse, who says he knows Senator Morse a little better than Senator Cordon, but he knows both of them; he wrote some weeks ago asking if he prepared an analysis on the whole question of statehood for Hawaii—he does not go into Alaska—if I would see that it was placed in the record. I have had time to read it only once. It strikes me as an unusually fine statement, not radical in any sense that I can see at all. He must be a very distinguished jurist, I would judge, from the wording of the statement. He has a two-page table of contents with his letter which is 30 pages long, his report. Two pages cover contents, and it will be of use, I think, to those who want to get the opposite view to some of the testimony that was stated here.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you desire to have that printed in the record as a brief?

Senator BUTLER. I would like to have that printed for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. It is so ordered.

Senator BUTLER. If Mr. Farrington would like to have a copy, I have one here.

(The report referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR M. CHURCHILL, PORTLAND, OREG.

DANGEROUS FACTORS IN PROPOSED HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

The bill to extend American statehood to the Hawaiian Islands appears at first glance rather meritorious. Most people would say "Yes." To them it has been made to sound like long overdue fair play. But beneath the surface it presents many grave questions, which call for very deep thought.

Despite the Gallup polls, editorials, resolutions, and platitudes, to which reference is made below, it is doubtful if 1 person in 100,000 has given this any really

adequate analysis. There has seemed to be no individual, or group, whose business it has been to diagnose and answer the highly financed and skillful propaganda employed in its promotion.

Not only will it upset the delicate system of checks and balances, which has made possible extension of our Federal system over a vast continent, but it may well plunge us into economic, social, and racial problems, of which most of the people have little conception.

It is difficult to know where to start in so complex a discussion. But in general I shall attempt to follow the following sequence:

1. Racial birth rates of Hawaiian and other groups, and their menace, not alone to the islands but to continental United States.

2. Hawaii's economic limits, the reduction that seem unavoidable in its war-swollen economy; that a large share of its war population is likely to have to return to the mainland; that its corporate, plantation economy tends to be alien to our experience.

3. The disrupting effect on our entire Federal system, if we attempt to incorporate offshore islands as States. That self-government is not the issue, but diluting the United States Senate.

4. That danger to our world position could easily follow, arising out of any misinterpretation of our action on delicate racial or other problems.

5. A review of the polls, editorials, and resolutions offered by statehood proponents in lieu of statesmanlike thought on the profound questions involved.

I. THE POPULATION PROBLEM IS CENTRAL

1. *Racial birth rates are of the essence*

Hawaii, in searching the world for cheap sugar labor, has assembled a mixture of races perhaps without precedent anywhere. This is frankly admitted by the statehood proponents. I shall deal later with their optimistic assurance that this is wholesome and that no harm can come from it.

What no one has realized, however, is that the islands are rapidly coming to exemplify the world's most appalling problem, the multiplication of people beyond the possibility of adequate food. Other factors enter into the statehood picture. They will be discussed in their turn. But racial birth rates have gone unnoticed. While the figures are published annually by the Hawaiian Board of Health, the proponents of statehood have omitted them entirely.

Delegate Farrington evidently sensed the danger in this subject. On pages 58 to 68 of the House hearings, he very cautiously led a friendly witness, Prof. Andrew W. Lind, over this delicate field. But the really significant figures were covered only in generalities. It has been necessary to dig these out of successive health reports, the census, and other sources. They are tabulated below.

Unfortunately few people read figures. Arithmetic seems to be a lost art. Neither peoples nor parliaments appear to study birth statistics.

2. *The meaning of "have-not" peoples*

Fundamentally we probably agree that World War II was basically an attempt by so-called "have-not" peoples to take by force the lands and resources of their neighbors. Hitler and Mussolini and the military element in Japan produced the leadership. But the force behind them was that their peoples felt: "We have not" and others "have."

But "have not" has a very simple meaning. The nation which cries out against this injustice has first multiplied its people beyond their means of support; then reached out to take from others. Japan had doubled her people and reached for Korea, Manchuria, and China. Italy had spawned to abject poverty and went out to take Ethiopia; Germany, whose numbers formerly were not larger than those of France, had increased its population by 50 percent. In both world wars she sought to expand to the east, the last time into the Ukraine.

3. *A more insidious war*

But crowding out one's neighbors by lower living standards is not less immoral than to do it by an international war. A camel with its head under the tent is not for this reason less a camel. When people, by excessive births multiply and "under-live" other men or groups, thus undermining their standard of living, the result is not different from a taking by war. This is being done today. The mixed races of Hawaii, the Puerto Ricans, and the French Canadians, as I shall point out below, are breeding out the Yankees, the English, the

Irish, the Scotch, and the Scandinavians just as surely as the sea swamps Holland when the dikes give way.

Human "power of multiplication is—always unimaginably vast. The descendants of a single couple whose multiplication was unrestricted could theoretically in a relatively short space of time amount to many millions" (Carr-Saunders). Food production, on the other hand, has definite limits. This is spectacularly true on islands, as is set out below.

4. *The explosion of peoples*

The atom bomb terrifies us. But perhaps it is not more deadly than the explosion of peoples. Islands are not so large but we can see what is going on. Ireland, before and after the potato famine, peculiarly illustrates this, as I shall point out. And Puerto Rico is an especially painful example. From the figures which I set out below, it appears that Hawaii is hastening to like disaster.

World population is increasing at the fabulous rate of 20,000,000 every year. Every 24 hours adds 55,000 more mouths to feed. Yet the recent United Nations Statistical Yearbook seems to make it clear that world food as a whole has not essentially increased in 20 years.

China, with its traditional (and poetic) family of seven, is bound to have recurring famines. At this very moment a terrible famine seems to be sweeping away millions of its people. Communism is a bait to the desperate.

India is increasing her people 5,000,000 a year. Yet last year her food supply, in big urban centers like Calcutta, was thought to be down to 900 calories per capita. Including her farmers, the average was estimated at 1,685 calories, just half of ours in America. Yet, as if that was not tragic enough, India's idealistic health leadership is dreaming of and actually initiating vast reforms to conquer her many dread diseases. Her present life span is about 27 years. If she succeeded in reaching for her people, an average age of 63 or 65 as with us, she would more than double her numbers, to eat the same food on which her present population is now starving.

5. *Is modern philanthropy a kindness?*

Western philanthropy, in a Christian effort to cure pain and misery by health measures, for the most part has only succeeded in lowering the death rate of fast-breeding peoples. For ages the death rate has been high. A hundred diseases have decimated humanity. A high birth rate has been essential. But philanthropy has not made much progress in lowering the birth rate of underdeveloped peoples. Only deaths have dropped. People have multiplied like grasshoppers or Australian rabbits.

Egypt gives a vivid illustration. With not over 2,500,000 people in 1800, it now has 20,000,000. The surplus is regarded by thoughtful students as at least 5,000,000. And this despite multiplied diseases, which produced a prewar death rate of 27.2. Now it is proposed that the health program of the United Nations be applied to these vicious diseases. That, as such, would be truly Christian.

But Egypt's birth rate (last prewar) is 43.2. Just imagine what would happen if the death rate of 27.2 were cut to that of the Hawaiian Japanese, 5.5. The difference between a birth rate of 43.2 and a death rate of 5.5 is 37.7. The Egyptians would be increasing at 3.77 percent a year. They would double their numbers in 20 years. In 40 years there would be 2,500,000,000 Egyptians by such a calculation, as many as today's entire world populations.

6. *"Japan's new weapon," flood's of babies*

Japan at the moment is the world's most spectacular example of this. Her people are increasing 2,940 every 24 hours, and asking us to feed the increase, which total 1,750,000 a year. This is General MacArthur's major headache, even more urgent than communism, if that were possible. How does this happen?

It is peculiarly a product of our American efficiency. Before the war Japan's increase was menacing enough. She had doubled her people since Perry came. While her birth rate, during the depression, fell from 33 to 30 or slightly lower, here death rate also went down from 24 to 17. Now our occupation forces have cut the death rate to the unheard of low (for Japan) of 12. American food has encouraged the birth rate back up to 34. The rate of increase is 22, or 2.2 percent, a year, twice the prewar rate.

Japan is being economically drowned by its flood of charming babies. The Japanese love children and their life centers in family relationships. Rice farmers can always use children to help out. Where this will end, no one knows.

General MacArthur's experts are at their wits end. In the appendix I submit a list of outstanding articles dealing with this Japanese crisis, ranging from writers in the London Economist, the United Nations World, the Jesuit magazine, America, to several highly scientific articles in the February American Sociological Review.

And, as I shall point out below, the per capita increase rate of Hawaiian Japanese is as bad or perhaps worse than that in Japan.

Nor is Japan being overfed. Recent United Nation's report (F A O) estimate that the Japanese are only getting 1,670 calories a day, compared with ours of 3,244. Even India, with a much milder climate to compensate with food, averages 1,685 calories per capita.

7. *Not a question of color or race*

This explosive collision between primitive birth rates and modern death rates is not a matter of color of peoples, nor even of races as such. There are individuals in all groups who seek to limit their progeny, to the end of raising their standard of living.

Caucasians are equally guilty. The Russians, with minor exceptions, are white. Yet their prewar birth rate was 44.2, compared with 30 for Japan, 19.3 for Ireland and 17 for the United States. Their good land is vastly less than we think, when we look at a flat map. They are cultivating down to an 8-inch rainfall. Most of their land mass is too dry, too cold, or too mountainous. The danger from excessive Russian breeding is as great as or greater than from communism.

Italy, too, is white. But she is the poverty child of Europe. Within a few days Fred Sparks, in a syndicated Chicago Daily News column, describing the squalor and poverty in Chioggia, Italy, says:

"This is the story of a double bed. Six persons sleep in it. To me it is the simple story of this tired world's main problem. Too many people to feed, house, and clothe—and more coming. * * * Italy, America's poorest relation, is increasing her population at the rate of 400,000 a year."

French Canada, also white, is as I shall point out below, equally a source of danger. And in Hawaii, the Puerto Ricans, largely of Spanish descent, have a higher birth rate even than the Japanese, and the Portuguese not too much lower.

Color, certainly, is no test of character. Under any coloring, or lack of it, may lie an extreme of charm and wisdom, of love, and self-sacrifice. God created many races. Each has a wealth to contribute to the common heritage. From all these laboratories have come rich contributions. The west can give much to the east. And we, in turn, can learn as much, perhaps more, from the cultures of the Orient, and even from primitive peoples.

8. *But mass mixing of peoples is dangerous*

Cultured leaders of every race can mingle easily. Friction rarely results. But mass mixing of peoples with totally different traditions and mores, drilled in and handed down through the ages has rarely brought anything but strife and disaster. Whether we are dealing with Asiatic resentment of Caucasians, or with ignorant prejudices in the United States, friction is close to the surface.

Human beings are only finite. Emotions and prejudices are not less real than calm reason. Few of us are so mature that we are free from childish judgments. And we are all busy. We tend to hasty opinions. We have little time to investigate the men we meet. We tend to classify people, not only by color and race, but by sex, clothing, years in school, and many other factors which may have little bearing on real character or worth. These are realities. At any foreseeable time they are inescapable.

Even families have tragic quarrels. Our divorces are legion. Even though our American melting pot is largely European, it is as yet very, very far from stability. Racial, regional, and religious cleavages exist everywhere. Surely this is no time to spread our none-too-stable balance over scattered islands of the sea, incorporating peoples mixed as perhaps nowhere else on earth.

With the above as a basic approach, we may turn to the facts of the Hawaiian Islands.

II. HAWAII AND ITS BIRTH RATES

9. *Hawaii faces the same fatal fecundity*

In the House hearings (p. 55, 506, 559) Delegate Farrington and Prof. Andrew W. Lind seek to create the impression that any problem from Japanese increase has been ended; that it is not now menacing. This is not true.

On the following pages I am tabulating birth records from the reports of the Hawaiian Bureau of Health. It is true that during the depression the Japanese birth rate dropped from 35.6 in 1929 to a low of 21.4 in 1940. But by 1947 it had again risen to 28.3. It has dropped off only very slightly for 1948 and 1949.

But what Mr. Farrington and Professor Lind overlook is the incredibly low Hawaiian death rate. Nobody seems to die over there. In 1947, while the Japanese birth rate in Hawaii had risen to 28.3, the death rate was only 5.3. Speaking for 1947, the Japanese in Hawaii were increasing 23 per 1,000, or 2.3 percent a year. That was even faster than the explosive rate in Japan.

The Chinese, Puerto Rican, and Korean birth rates are similar, but their numbers were smaller to begin with. The non-Haole peoples are taking Hawaii just as surely as a lava flow overruns a volcanic region. In 16 years (from 1929 to 1947, but omitting 1940, 1941, 1948, and 1949, whose figures I did not then have), the total Haole births were 16,439, after deducting 600 a year after 1939 for Portuguese and Spanish from other Caucasian. The total births for all races was 167,106. Subtracting gives 150,667 as the total of non-Haole births. The Japanese births alone were 62,961. And the Haole total included a large increase of births from the temporary war population from the mainland. Even then, the non-Haole births were nine times as great as the Haoles and the Japanese alone nearly four times as great.

In the face of these figures, the promoters of statehood seem less than frank when they include 35,000 Portuguese and perhaps up to 100,000 white war workers and their families to make 172,583 Caucasians as of January 1, 1946. By the official reports, 23,000 of these war workers and their families had already gone by January 1, 1950. And the January 1950, unemployment of some 34,000 would indicate that large additional numbers would presently leave.

The Japanese population in Hawaii is increasing about 4,000 a year and the total non-Haole population about 8,500 to 9,000 a year. In view of the acute economic situation and shortage of jobs, which I shall presently point out, what is to become of this endless expansion of humanity? Are they to follow the flood of Puerto Ricans to New York City? Or will they emigrate to Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, and Seattle?

One witness (p. 568 of the House hearings) states that the majority of the Japanese come from the prefecture of Hiroshima. The remarkable coincidence that Hiroshima Japanese, by their mere growth in numbers, should present this problem, is striking indeed.

The Japanese attitude toward large families perhaps is illustrated by this same witness on page 572 of the House hearings:

"I made a survey of grammar-school students on the big island in 1940 and 99 percent of the answers to my questions indicated the life ambition of the males was to work for the plantations, and of the girls to work at 'Hoe hanna' long enough to get a man, then to raise all the kids they could. Their ideas of the proper-sized family varies from 5 to 10 children. A few said 'many as we can get, 15 to 20 mebbe'."

Nor do I think the peak of babies has been reached. It is the females who bear the children. In 1900 there were only 13,603 Japanese females in the islands. By 1940 there were 75,985. In 1900 there were 349.2 males to 100 females. By 1940 the ratio was down to 110.3.

By contrast the Caucasian birthrate went down to 10.1 in 1946, though it rose to 16.2 in 1947. And this included the Portuguese. If these were deducted, the rate would be substantially lower. And it is probably raised by the temporary war force also.

10. *Will the Haoles disappear, along with the Hawaiians?*

On the next page, separately, I am tabulating the births and birthrates, by races, so far as I can find them, and as they are significant for this study. They are instructive, if not startling.

The pure Hawaiians have all but disappeared already. When Captain Cook came they were very numerous. But they fell easy victims to the white man's diseases. By 1896 they were down to 31,019, and, in January 1950, to 10,500.

It is true that part-Hawaiians have multiplied to 74,941, as of January 1, 1950. But this is deceptive. To my mind the census of 1940, and the health bureau from that time on, were guilty of gravely confusing the figures, when they ceased numbering the Caucasian-Hawaiians and Asiatic-Hawaiians separately, and ceased enumerating the Portuguese, Spanish, and other Caucasian contract-labor groups separately. From then on they have used the obscuring term "Part-Hawaiians" and the term "Other Caucasians," to include Portuguese, etc., whose background and mores were quite different from the so-called Haole group.

10-A. Hawaiian births and birth rates, by races

NUMBER OF BIRTHS

Year	All races	Pure Hawaiian	Caucasian Hawaiian	Asiatic Hawaiian	Portuguese	Haole	Japanese
1929.....	11,248	418	994	823	568	840	4,888
1930.....	10,814	425	773	1,006	576	804	4,605
1931.....	10,463	367	712	1,055	614	813	4,365
1932.....	10,493	514	828	1,081	653	780	4,265
1933.....	9,633	408	810	1,067	570	727	3,740
1934.....	8,295	354	794	1,165	403	852	3,576
1935.....	9,196	388	834	1,158	218	1,099	3,543
1936.....	8,581	283	796	1,220	569	707	3,059
1937.....	8,983	329	817	1,302	607	726	3,236
1938.....	9,062	345	767	1,405	554	827	3,184
1939.....	9,392	339	787	1,504	344	1,211	3,300
1940.....	9,524	317	839	1,556	500	1,173	3,337
			Part-Hawaiian		Caucasian		
1941.....							
1942.....	10,377	268	2,583		1,947		3,589
1942.....	10,977	232	3,008		1,518		3,990
1944.....	10,186	222	3,132		1,964		4,468
1945.....	12,597	228	3,212		2,030		4,504
1946.....	11,945	202	3,093		1,751		4,400
1947.....	14,050	233	3,314		2,807		4,817
1948.....	14,482	172	3,367		3,221		4,705
1949.....	14,222	166	3,425		2,853		4,712
	214,520						80,283

BIRTH RATES

Year	All races	Pure Hawaiian	Caucasian Hawaiian	Asiatic Hawaiian	Portuguese	Haole	Japanese
1929.....	31.2	18.4	65.0	67.6	20.6	18.9	35.6
1930.....	29.1	18.8	49.2	79.2	20.9	17.2	32.8
1931.....	27.4	16.3	44.0	79.3	22.2	16.6	30.5
1932.....	26.7	18.5	49.9	78.3	23.6	15.2	29.2
1933.....	23.8	18.3	47.4	74.3	20.5	13.5	25.1
1934.....	22.4	15.9	45.4	78.2	14.5	15.2	23.5
1935.....							
1936.....							
1937.....							
1938.....							
1939.....							
1940.....	22.6	15.0	39.4	70.2	16.2	16.3	21.4
			Part-Hawaiian		Caucasian		
1941.....							
1942.....	23.6						
1943.....	26.7						
1944.....	27.9						
1945.....	25.3	20.1	53.3		12.2		27.9
1946.....	23.4	18.5	49.3		10.1		27.2
1947.....	26.9	21.5	50.5		16.2		28.3
1948.....	26.8	16.2	48.0		17.8		26.7
1949.....	26.8	15.7	46.7		17.4		26.2

As noted in the text, after the census of 1940, and including the fiscal year 1941, the Caucasian-Hawaiian and Asiatic-Hawaiian were merged as Part-Hawaiian; and the Portuguese were merged with the Haoles and all classed as Caucasian.

Professor Lind, however, helps us to understand the Part-Hawaiians. On page 559 he explains that intermarriages have been mostly with Chinese, Filipinos, Spanish, Koreans, and Puerto Ricans, who tended to have lesser numbers of their own women.

The figures from 1929 to 1939 fortunately show the distinction between the Caucasian-Hawaiian and Asiatic-Hawaiian. While the pure Hawaiian births were dropping from 418 a year to 166 a year, the mixed Hawaiian increased from

1,817 to 3,425, in 1950. But the Caucasian-Hawaiian births, to 1939, were decreasing, while the Asiatic-Hawaiians were doubling, from 823 to 1,504. By now they are probably not less than 2,500 a year, if they were segregated. This only accentuates the facts that the Asiatics are taking the islands.

The death rate of the pure Hawaiians, meantime, has been very high. In 1949 it was 26.3 with a birth rate of only 16.2. Whereas the Part-Hawaiians, largely Asiatic-Hawaiians, had, on the contrary, a birth rate of 46.7 against a death rate of 4.5 percent and the Japanese had a birth rate of 26.2 with a death rate of 5.5 (for 1949).

11. *Who is going to leave and where are they going?*

The proponents of statehood seek to leave the impression that the islands are just getting well started, that their numbers will be much greater in the future. As I shall point out below, this is untrue. Very responsible opinion in the islands believes that Hawaii has 25 percent more people now than its normal economy can support.

If 25 percent (of normal numbers) are to leave, that would be 100,000. Then if each year, by the excess of births over deaths, the non-Haole groups add 8,500 to 10,000 to their numbers, that many additional human beings must go somewhere else each year.

Who is going to be forced out? Will the easy-going Hawaiians survive? That is the few of them who are left? Will the Haoles maintain themselves? Or will the islands gradually be taken over by the rapid-breeding peoples, inured by centuries of tradition and experience to much lower living standards?

The world's experience has only one answer. Just as the Japanese in prewar days could not compete, in Korea, Manchuria, and Formosa, with the Chinese and Koreans, whose standard of living was lower, except for a few officials or white-collar workers, so the rapidly breeding peoples, with their lower standards of living, will inexorably take Hawaii.

And after the lava flow of children has driven the Hawaiians and Haoles out, what then of the annual overflow? There can be but one answer. It will go to the mainland, if permitted.

III. HAWAII'S ECONOMIC LIMITS

12. *Islands have limits, Ireland and Puerto Rico*

Island people must live within their food supplies or starve. Primitive islands learned this ages ago. They knew that if they expanded people beyond their food, death was the only answer. By infanticide, abortion, or by leaving their aged to die, they managed to keep their numbers in balance.

Ireland dramatizes the danger of not heeding these limits. Her population grew from 1,250,000 in 1700 to 4,500,000 in 1800; then to 8,175,124 in 1841, just prior to the famine. Early marriage was encouraged and emigration denounced. Then came the potato blight and famine. A million died. A million and a half emigrated, and gradually the population was cut from 8,175,124 in 1841 to 4,229,124 in 1931.

Since the famine the Irish birthrate has been greatly reduced. By 1868 it was down to 27.4 and just prewar to 19.3. The marriage rate is only half of that of England and western Europe in general. Marriages are very late and by these or other means of birth control, Ireland limits her population to her food. As a result her people have sufficient to eat. Her calorie consumption is 3,260, equal to that of the United States.

Puerto Rico is likewise an island. But the difference is tragic. When the United States annexed that island in 1898, the population was stationary at 953,243. Her death rates balanced her birthrates. But in our American desire to be helpful, we sent in doctors and health measures. Her death rate has been cut from 31 to 13.9, while her birthrate has grown from 30 to 42.4. Increasing at present at 2.3 percent a year, Puerto Rico is described as the worst slum under the American flag.

13. *What are the limits of Hawaii?*

In the House hearings of 1946, and even in the Senate hearings of 1948, proponents of statehood produced the impression that the rosy picture could scarcely be overdrawn; that the islands might be expected to expand their people and their economy indefinitely.

What are the real facts? Hawaii is too far from any mass market to manufacture for export. That would be true even if she had coal, oil, or other energy and ample raw materials, which she does not. Her existence rests, and will rest,

on agriculture, except as supplemented by United States military expenditures and by tourists.

The Hawaiian Islands total 4,099,840 acres. But nearly all of this is too mountainous for use except as pasture. Only about 309,310 acres, or 7 percent, is in use for crops, and there seems little prospect of major expansion of the crop area.

Being in the Tropics, in the latitude of Cuba and Calcutta, many Temperate Zone food plants do not thrive. Some 75 to 85 percent of the food of the people is brought in from the mainland. After vast experimentation and research, over many years, only sugar and pineapples have been found to succeed and be profitable, on a scale to be significant. In the last analysis, therefore, only as many people can live in the islands as the sale price of the sugar and pineapple will provide with food—apart from military and tourist expenditures and from limited supplies of beef, coffee, fruits, and vegetables grown for local use.

14. The war boom has burst—Unemployment is serious

Conditions appear to have completely changed, even since the Cordon hearings in 1948.

World War II brought a vast boom to Hawaii. The Government spent hundreds of millions there. The labor force rose to 220,000. Army and Navy civilian employees rose from 14,000 in 1940 to 63,900, or slightly more at the peak in 1945. Many additional jobs were done by men in uniform. The population grew to 541,853 before the turn came.

But in February 1949 the rise came to an abrupt halt. By July 1 the population had dropped to 530,891, and by January 1, 1950, to 527,473. The white group, in Honolulu, lost 23,365 people. But the other racial groups, by heavy birthrates, kept right on increasing by about 9,000 a year, so that the total population only decreased 14,380.

By January 1, 1946, Army and Navy civilian employment had dropped from the 1945 peak of 63,900, or 64,500 in the spring of 1945, to 52,200. I have written for the present numbers but am not too sure of the present status, but I think it below 30,000.

Unemployment, as of Governor Stainback's report of June 30, 1949, was 21,000. By January 1950, it was described in the Honolulu press as 33,000 to 34,000. In June 1948, several months after the Cordon hearings only 3.6 percent of the labor force was unemployed. But by July 1, 1949, Governor Stainback estimates the 21,000 unemployed to be 11.5 percent of the labor force. On the newspaper figure of 34,000 in January, 1950, it would have risen to about 18.7 percent. Any unemployment over 12 percent is termed "critical." Only San Diego on the mainland west coast is thus classified as "E" or "critical."

15. The future is not promising, except for much reduced numbers

Addressing Honolulu Chamber of Commerce groups in January, outstanding citizens felt that the population had grown 100,000 in the past 10 years, with no important growth in the basic industries; that the islands had 25 percent more people than they could normally support; that the Territory was living off of its wartime fat, meaning the savings from the hundreds of millions spent there by the Government during the war. The newspapers emphasized this crisis.

Yet even in 1949 the Army and Navy payroll seems to have been \$128,000,000 compared with a payroll by the sugar industry of \$59,000,000. One can only speculate on what would happen to the island economy if the world should achieve peace, or if a changing strategy should reduce Hawaiian military expenditures to a prewar figure. The collapse up to now would be mild by comparison.

Moreover sugar and pineapple are like other industries. They are constantly adding mechanization to cheapen production. That tends to less jobs and if there are no other basic industries to take up the slack in employment, this can be serious. Prewar (say from 1935 or 1936) half the working population was described by Mr. Chaunsey B. Wightman (p. 111) as being employed in the sugar industry. Since the sugar employment, even in 1946, was only 28,500, and the total labor force was then 194,000, to revert to a time when sugar employed half would mean a pretty grave drop.

The whole tone of the testimony in 1946 and 1948 was rainbow-colored. To realize the change, one should read Governor Stainback's 1949 report, notably pages 1, 2, 20, 41, and 45; and the Honolulu press of January 13 and 21, 1950, or thereabouts. To lose 23,365 people in 18 months and simultaneously increase the unemployed to 34,000 involves a catastrophic change in the fundamental situation.

16. *The strike disaster*

This was supplemented, beginning on May 1, 1949, and extending into October, by a 159-day longshore strike which paralyzed the island's economy. Of this Governor Stainback says:

"Steamship service in Hawaii's life line. It cannot survive without this service. A waterfront strike in Hawaii is the same as a general strike in the mainland."

And, on October 4, 1949, speaking on the Town Meeting radio program in Honolulu, as a colleague of Senator Cain, Mr. Daniel G. Ridley of the Honolulu bar, opposing statehood, said:

"May I point out that by acquiring statehood we would weaken our economic relations with the mainland. Due to our geographical position, Hawaii has problems which are different from those existing in any of the States. The whole economy of our islands is dependent upon ocean commerce which, under the American Constitution, is solely within the jurisdiction of the United States Congress to regulate. As a Territory, we are the responsibility of the Members of the Congress. As a State, we would be the sole responsibility of merely two Senators and one or two Representatives."

17. *The tide has turned*

The figures for the past 3 years prove precisely what I am contending. The fast-breeding groups are driving out the Haoles and the Hawaiians. The tide has started to run out.

During the 18 months preceding January 1, 1950, 23,365 Caucasians left the islands, reducing the white elements, apart from Portugese and Puerto Ricans, from 155,480 to about 122,000. These figures are obtained by deducting from the official estimates 35,000 as being the approximate number of Portugese.

However, during the past 3 years, since the House hearings, the non-Haole increase (births over deaths) has been about 9,000 a year, or 27,000 in all. These added 27,000 mouths to feed have more than taken place of the departing 23,365 war workers and their families.

Year by year the tide is bound to continue and to swell. The islands, by sheer fecundity, are passing to the groups with high birth rates. If the 34,000 unemployed in January should remain a permanent figure, they and their families will likewise have to leave, or be fed by the public purse. It requires no prophetic gaze to see the future.

Unless conditions change completely, there can be little doubt but, if statehood were granted, we should be incorporating into the Union, a forty-ninth State destined to be mixed Japanese, Chinese, Puerto Rican, Filipino, Korean, and Portugese. We should understand that fact.

IV. THE FUTURE OF NORTH AMERICA

But that is not the worst. About 122,000 Haoles still remain. Increasing at, say, 9,000 a year by births over deaths, the non-Haole groups would increase their number in 14 years sufficiently to take the place of the white groups. Then the lava flow of expansion must go somewhere else. Where will they go and what will that mean to continental United States?

18. *Comparing Puerto Rico and French Canada with Ireland and with Irishmen in North America*

It is doubtful if any comparison could be made which will so startle us as to study the differential situation between Irish groups and French Canadians and Puerto Ricans. We all know that New England Yankees have measurably lost out in the United States. We know that English and Scotch and Swedes and Norwegians have learned to restrain their numbers. But the Irish situation has not been emphasized. It will come with something of a shock.

Repeating what was said above under "Islands Have Limits," after the potato famine of 1846 Ireland cut her birthrate decisively to 27.4 in 1868 and to 19.3 in 1939. Her marriage rate is by far the lowest I have found in Europe. (See Encyclopedia Britannica, 1926, vol. 18, p. 237.) Of 10,000 marriageable persons, her marriage rate was only 254, compared with 418 for Norway, 507 for England and Wales, 533 for Belgium, 572 for the Netherlands, 574 for Italy, 1,223 for Bulgaria.

In America the trend seems similar. The Irish are an urban people. And urban birth rates are notoriously low. The Millbank Fund studies add to this good ground for believing that in the United States the Irish are not much more

than replacing themselves. But, if our figures are not conclusive, the Canadian figures seem to be.

In Canada also the Irish tend to be urban. And Canadian censuses give the racial origin of their people. In 70 years, from 1871 to 1941, Canadians of Irish descent only increased 50 percent, from 846,414 to 1,237,792. Moreover it is almost certain that nearly all of that gain was from further immigration after 1871, not from births. In other words the Irish in Canada, and almost certainly in the United States, are increasing by births very slowly if at all.

But, while the Irish in Canada only gained 50 percent in 70 years, including immigration, the French Canadians, by births alone and without immigration to help, multiplied four times. In 1871 they were 1,082,940. By 1941 they were 4,391,424, including 908,386 estimated to have moved over into New England or elsewhere in the United States.

The French Canadians have multiplied not less than seven times as fast as the Irish.

19. *The Puerto Ricans are just starting*

We all know that Puerto Rico is in desperate state. But we have given little thought to the airplane migration to Harlem. That flow, in my judgment, threatens a crisis we little dream of.

When we took over Puerto Rico in 1898, as stated above, deaths about equaled births. The island was amply full, with 953,243 people. But, by 1947, the population had grown to 2,149,000, plus 200,000 to 250,000 in New York City, or to a total of, say, 2,395,000.

But the growth so far is as child's play compared with the future. Originally the death rate was 31, as high as the birth rate. But we have completely upset nature's balance. Sending in health and doctors, we have gradually cut the death rate from 31, down to 13.1 in 1946. Meantime the birth rate, encouraged by our improvements, has skyrocketed from 26.9 in 1898 to 39.2 in 1939 and to 42.4 in 1946. At the 1946 rate the Puerto Ricans are doubling every 24 years.

Where are the excess Puerto Ricans to go, and in a few years the excess Hawaiians? Already 200,000 to 250,000 Puerto Ricans are in New York City, half as many as the Negroes there. In 25 years they may well push 2,000,000 people out of New York, Irish, Italians, Jews, Negroes.

20. *People increase in geometrical ratio*

Few people realize that populations, like compound interest, increase in geometrical ratio, not arithmetical ratio. The Encyclopedia Americana estimates, and my calculations agree, that the French Canadians have doubled every 27 years for 200 years, since they started with 70,000 in 1763. We may well ponder the fantastic figures that would be reached by the present numbers of Puerto Ricans doubling every 24 years and the French Canadians every 27 years. The following figures are just simple arithmetic.

If rates of increase continue

Puerto Ricans, doubling every 24 years:		French Canadians, dou- bling every 27 years:	
1947 -----	2, 395, 000	1941 -----	4, 391, 424
1971 -----	4, 790, 000	1968 -----	8, 782, 848
1995 -----	9, 580, 000	1995 -----	17, 565, 696
2019 -----	19, 160, 000	2022 -----	35, 131, 392
2043 -----	38, 320, 000	2049 -----	70, 262, 784
2067 -----	76, 640, 000	2076 -----	140, 525, 568
2091 -----	153, 280, 000	2105 -----	281, 051, 136

The Hawaiians of Japanese, Chinese, Puerto Ricans, and other fast-multiplying ancestry have a rate of increase nearly as great. Surely Delegate Farrington and the Hawaiian Statehood Commission and Professor Lind could scarcely have sensed the crucial meaning of birth rates when they omitted figures of this character.

V. WANTED FORTHWITH AN IMMIGRATION LAW BASED ON BIRTH RATES

I believe a somewhat more adequate form of self-government may well be evolved for offshore islands. I shall discuss this below. But the immediate need is for something else. Congress should proceed at once to work out immi-

gration restrictions based on the birth rates of peoples. Roughly it should be provided that:

"Apart from all other provisions, no person shall be allowed to enter the United States as a permanent resident, until and unless he shall have clearly established to the Immigration Service that he belongs to a race or group or nation which has an average birth rate not in excess of (say) 23 per 1,000."

And, even if it takes a constitutional amendment, if at all possible this restriction should be made applicable to groups on offshore islands heretofore by grave misjudgment admitted by statute to citizenship, and without anticipating that excessive birth rates would render such peoples a menace to the mores and balance of the Western World.

The world resents restrictions based on color. Men cannot help their color. But no person or people may fairly resent the fact that high-standard countries refuse to be inundated by other peoples of excessive fecundity.

Nothing perhaps could be conceived which would more dramatize to the world why its people live and die in misery and squalor. Population experts know the facts. Dr. Warren S. Thompson was called to Japan to advise Japanese authorities. But the masses of the people do not read the words of the thinkers. But a clear-cut decision by the Congress that excessive birth rates are the major obstacle to high human standards would travel the world like a radio wave. It might take President Truman's four-point program many decades to achieve as much.

VI. OTHER FACTORS WHICH CHALLENGE ATTENTION

21. *A tropical, corporate, plantation economy, is it alien to American institutions?*

I have no quarrel with Hawaiian plantation operators. On the whole it seems to me they have done a constructive and a difficult job. Originally doubtless there was cynicism and unfairness. But in later years the management seems to have proven considerate of all associated with it. Probably corporate organization alone would provide the capital and size required. And a mass of plantation employees seems indispensable.

Nevertheless corporate, industrialized farming on this scale seems alien to our temperate zone set-up, where small farms make the basic pattern. Small-farm thinking is dominant here, and widespread ownerships. Whereas the record indicates that only 8.7 percent of Hawaiian land is owned by widely distributed individuals.

Out colonial days were somewhat similar. Gracious living but short-sighted southern planters needed labor badly, if they were to operate extensive plantations in tobacco and cotton. They purchased from traders large numbers of Negro slaves. The system did not end until with the Civil War. And from it we still inherit a race problem whose end we may never see.

So the sugar plantations, developing a major industry in the semitropical volcanic Hawaiian Islands, in the latitude of Cuba and Calcutta, also needed labor in large numbers. Slavery was a thing of the past. But in the overcrowded rice lands of the Orient there were endless millions of low-standard workers; also of Portuguese in the Azores. Many thousands of these were brought in as contract laborers. The Japanese Government, indeed, sent in many before annexation.

Even after the Chinese Exclusion Act and the gentlemen's agreement with Japan, apparently Hawaii sought and obtained an exception from the latter and the Japanese kept right on coming down to 1924 at least. One witness, on pages 568 and 570 of the House hearings, tells of rather general later arrival of Japanese, despite the laws.

With this cheap labor sugar was produced cheaply, quite as in Cuba. However, by a struggle from 1893 to 1898, the Hawaiian interest, presumably including the sugar operators, finally achieved annexation to the United States. The sugar that was thus cheaply produced by labor from the rice lands, was given entry duty-free into the great American market. Under the act of 1937 the sugar plantations even have received a benefit payment of \$8 to \$10 a ton, totaling \$6,000,000 to \$7,000,000 a year, out of the United States Treasury. Without this, ex-Delegate King testified (p. 42) the sugar industry would have been bankrupted.

22. *The sugar industry now wants statehood*

Now, if we may judge by the statements of Governor Stainback, Mr. Chauncey B. Wightman, and Mr. Slaton M. Miller, printed in the hearings, the sugar industry wants statehood. If their 14,000 stockholders and 28,500 employees have been

urged to support statehood, that might account for much of the favorable voting in the plebiscite.

The cheap oriental labor and the Portuguese from the Azores, who came in under contract, and their children and grandchildren, are now being paid much higher wages besides costly perquisites. Sugar has higher costs. Not satisfied with being placed in the mainland market tariff-free and with receiving \$6,000,000 to \$7,000,000 a year in benefit payments, Hawaii wants to escape the sugar quota limits provided by the Jones-Costigan Act. I quote part of Governor Stainback's statement, from pages 18 and 19 of the House hearings:

"In the mainland they can produce all the sugar they want. Hawaii cannot. The mainland has absolute production, not that I am condemning the Jones-Costigan Act. It has been very valuable to the Territory. So don't misunderstand my statement about the Jones-Costigan Act. I am not condemning it as such. We get benefits, but not quite as much as the mainland gets. * * *

"The great advantage (of statehood) is that we would have representation in the United States Government. * * * If we had two Senators in Congress we would be entitled to be treated as a State, and no discrimination could be made."

23. *Trading Senators' votes*

This last statement of Governor Stainback is the backbone of the campaign's objectives. Everywhere I went in Hawaii in January, when I happened to be there on a vacation trip, I heard essentially two reasons put forward for statehood: (1) "No taxation without representation" which I shall discuss below and which seems to me to be purely a catch-phrase and a platitude; and (2) we want two senatorial votes to trade for things the islands want.

Since trading Senators' votes does not appeal to me as a great statesmanship, I am not impressed by this objective. I realize that, to obtain a majority in a large legislative body, many cross-currents are often merged. But to make trading of votes an outstanding objective, seems to me to discredit the statehood movement. The nearer we can approach having each issue decided on its merits purely, especially in the Senate, the better government we will achieve for all.

Nowhere in the records is there any serious complaint of unfairness to Hawaii on the part of Congress. On the other hand, when Senator Cordon finally prevailed upon Mr. Walter Dillingham to testify, among other things he said (292) :

"Now if it is true, as it is, that we have prospered in the last 50 years more than they have prospered under a State form of government, we cannot have been very much handicapped under our Territorial form of government. I have had occasion to go to Washington in the interest of the Territory, in my official capacity. I have been there many times in connection with the development of our harbors, and in land matters, and in labor matters, and I have contacted the leaders of the Senate and the House, and I have never found any attitude or disposition or wish on the part of any of these men to treat us other than we would be treated if we were representing a State. Whatever was fair, and whatever we should have, there was sympathy and an attitude of help, and we have derived many substantial benefits from the Congress of the United States which have helped materially in the progress we have made * * *."

24. *Making common cause with Alaska*

Whether or not Alaska should be admitted as a State has not the slightest relation to the Hawaiian issue. Each should be decided solely on its own merits and on nothing else. Even Senator Cordon, who had himself conducted hearings in Hawaii, said on the floor of the Senate May 20, 1948:

"Mr. President, I feel that I am not competent to pass upon the merits of the Alaskan bill for statehood. I feel that there is a very great difference between the two cases as of the moment."

When two totally distinct highly promoted campaigns make common cause, perhaps because one appeals to the Republicans and the other to the Democrats, citizens are entitled to feel that there must be lack of merit in both cases. To indulge in mutual back-slapping on an issue so revolutionary as taking off-shore islands in as constituent States of the Republic seems highly improper.

25. *Communism and Harry Bridges*

The immature and racially biased workers of Hawaii were an open invitation to a man of Harry Bridges' type. With his right-hand man, Jack W. Hall, he moved in and presently took control. The Senate need not guess as to who

dominates Hawaii. On pages 131 and 137 of the House hearings, Mr. Hall boasts for the record that his organization is in political and economic control. I quote, in part (132) :

"Today, 2 years later, the vast majority of the workers in Hawaii's basic industries—sugar and pineapple—are represented by the ILWU. Some 33,000 employees, of all nationalities, races, and creeds, are employed in the bargaining units * * * (for which the ILWU is certified for). Of the 30 seats in the house of representatives, 16 of those elected were from the 21 endorsed by Labor's Political Action Committee. In the senate, out of 9 positions open, the LPAC endorsed candidates for 7 seats and 6 were elected."

No one, he says, need worry further about the Big Five controlling things (133). (Mr. Hall is strongly for statehood) :

"If that control existed today—and thank God it does not—we would be violently opposed to statehood at this time."

Nothing I could say would add to the very careful and well-documented report of Senator Butler on this subject. My contribution, if it be deemed such, is on other phases of the statehood issue. However, as one citizen, I am thoroughly convinced that Senator Butler is correct in his judgment and that, because of the menace of communism alone, if there were no other adequate grounds, statehood should not be given at this time.

26. *The dockworkers strike*

Communist or not, rarely has one man made his power so felt in gripping a community by the throat, as Bridges did in the 159-day longshore strike in 1949.

And we in Oregon were made profoundly conscious of the long reach of the Bridges hand. When he managed to prevent by violence the unloading of a pineapple barge at The Dalles, Oreg., an inland port far removed from the Hawaiian Islands, he was displaying a power which Stalin might envy. The courts are belatedly punishing the Bridges presumption at The Dalles. But the Oregon farmers who rallied to unload the pineapple barge have had something of a lesson in who controls Hawaii.

VII. WHAT STATEHOOD REALLY MEANS

27. *Statehood to an offshore island would initiate a revolution in American Government.*

Statehood would be irrevocable if once granted. Regardless of consequences, there would be no road back. We cannot step out, as we decided to do in the Philippines. For reasons which are difficult to fully express, we may well agree with the late Nicholas Murray Butler when he said in the New York Herald Tribune of August 25, 1947, that the admission of Hawaii as a State "might easily be the first step in bringing to an end the United States of America as established by the founding fathers and as we have known it."

Senator Eckton expressed very well the extreme importance of the question when, on page 30 of the Senate proceedings of 1948, he said :

"The Congress of the United States has never before faced a problem of this kind in formulating such a policy and it should be considered and explored to the nth degree in our committees and subcommittees. For the first time we are considering the possibility of admitting an offshore Territory as a separate and distinct State of our Union and making it the forty-ninth State of the United States."

Similarly Senator Cain, speaking on a Town Meeting radio debate in Honolulu on October 4, 1949, said :

"A much more important reason, however (for hesitation), is this: When the question of statehood for Hawaii is before the Senate of the United States, that body must determine whether noncontiguous Territories are to be admitted in the future as States of the Union. No such policy has yet been seriously discussed or agreed to.

"If Hawaii, situated 2,400 miles from the mainland at San Francisco, is granted statehood, it will mean that other Territories will become States in time. Each new State will have two Senators. There are today substantial Senators and acknowledged students of government who presently feel that the Senate would become an utterly unwieldy body should its membership, now of 96, be materially increased."

28. *Destroying the Federal balance*

Our Federal Government is a highly complex organization. It involves a Union, not only of 48 States, but of thousands of local governmental units. It covers a far greater extent of Territories and greater diversities of regions and interests, than any governmental unit heretofore dreamed of by men, in which the people compromise and rule, instead of being submitted to a dictatorship.

Our Government becomes increasingly complex. It is highly experimental. Policies, domestic and foreign, must be approved by the people. Constantly there must be trial and error. To harmonize the views of millions of citizens taxes the best brains we can produce.

Our success, so far as we are successful, rests on an intricate set of checks and balances. We weigh the legislative versus the executive versus the judicial; Federal versus State versus local government; farms versus labor versus capital; South versus North versus West. We have pressures of competing industries, endless variation in religious groups, lodges, civic organizations, racial and national elements, with extreme possibilities of friction.

Though we are largely of European origin, our differences are legion. Modern science and the problems of our capitalistic economy test our capacities to the utmost. Surely we have enough to solve and to digest, without distorting our whole structure by starting to incorporate into our constituent State off-shore islands, whose end and number no one can foresee. And, as I have pointed out above, with these would come racial elements whose age-old traditions and mores are deeply fixed and as alien to ours as anything the earth has to offer. And they differ equally from each other, as they do from us.

29. *Diluting the Senate*

The real crux of Hawaii's campaign, as has been pointed out, is to obtain two Senators, with votes to trade.

Adding Senators from sundry off-shore islands will gravely affect the balance and efficiency of the Senate. Even 96 Senators are doubtless many more than the founding fathers had any thought of. There is far too much need, even with that number, to trade votes on unrelated issues, in order to obtain legislative action.

Senators should more and more represent the general national interest and not be primarily local agents. We succeed as a democracy, insofar as we do, because we avoid splinter parties. European parliaments are all too often reduced to helplessness by diluted representation. Ninety-six Senators are enough. We must not become too cumbersome for action.

VIII. WANTED—A NEW GOVERNMENTAL FORM

30. *Not merely Hawaii and Alaska*

It is foolish to deceive ourselves that this transformation will be limited to Hawaii and Alaska, because these are the only two "organized" Territories. When Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands or Guam or Samoa want to enter, such a distinction will be brushed aside as unimportant.

Perhaps the ablest legal witness for statehood admitted this. The statehood proponents placed on the stand in Honolulu Mr. Heaton L. Wrenn, president of the Hawaiian Bar Association. On page 382 of the House hearings he was asked specifically whether other islands or possessions would be entitled to be accepted as States, if they demonstrated a like capacity to manage their own affairs. He replied: "Why, certainly, I wouldn't advocate statehood for Hawaii and not advocate it for others, who had entitled themselves to it."

No one can prophesy what islands may yet come under our wing. There is just one logical and defensible place to stop. That is with the limits of continental United States. We have gone far enough. We were glad to free ourselves from further responsibilities in the Philippines. We cannot similarly retreat from islands necessarily under our aegis. But it would be the acme of folly to set them up as new States.

31. *Self-Government is quite different*

For Hawaii to ask for self-government is quite proper. But essentially she has that already. For 50 years she has had her own legislature and made her own laws, and has chosen the officials, with limited exceptions, to enforce those laws.

It is true that the President of the United States appoints the Governor and the judges. If the Hawaiians want to elect their Governor I see no great objection to that. By the act of 1947, effective in 1948, Puerto Ricans have been given the

right to elect their own Governor and he is to select his own cabinet. Hawaii may well be treated similarly.

While the election of judges, anywhere, is of dubious wisdom, especially in large cities, because the people have little idea of judicial qualifications, undoubtedly some local system of appointment, such as the Missouri plan or that proposed by the American Judicature Society, might well be worked out. That should cause no trouble.

But self-government is not what is desired at all. What is being fought for, by the politicians, by the sugar interests, by the ILWU, is to be given two United States Senators. The "self-government" cry is misleading.

32. An acceptable provision for off-shore islands is quite possible to achieve

It is quite possible that our traditional Territorial framework is not altogether suitable to areas like Hawaii. Government is always in process of evolution. The evolution of ours has gone far since John Marshall entered the Supreme Court.

From time to time totally new forms are required. The United Nations is new. The British Commonwealths are a new development. The Hoover Committee's recommendations will transform much of the administrative machinery of the United States. Consolidation of Army, Navy, and Air Force into the Defense Department surely is revolutionary. Numberless alphabetical agencies came into being during the depression and the war.

The giving to Puerto Rico the right to choose her own Governor is a case in point. The time may well have come when the United States should sit down with thoughtful citizens from the Hawaiian Islands and devise a governmental relationship which will be in the best interest of both.

To proceed on the theory that because continental areas became first Territories and then States, therefore the same procedure should be followed with off-shore islands is like insisting we should be driving a horse and buggy instead of using a jet plane or a radio.

Moreover, a form or arrangement suited to Hawaii might not be adapted to Alaska or Puerto Rico or Guam. Inventiveness has its place in politics as well as in the realm of physics.

IX. STATEHOOD MIGHT WELL MENACE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

In these critical days we must take care to preserve the good opinion of the world. Demagogues criticize us on every possible occasion. The Russian press misses no such opportunity. Race relations, in particular, are a most delicate subject.

As I have pointed out above, if we admit Hawaii we shall plunge ourselves into a racial and birth-rate mixture that is extreme. Many pressures and pressure-groups are bound to arise out of it. To handle them all tactfully and without complaint will require a genius that human beings rarely possess. The disappointed will charge the United States with prejudice, selfishness, discrimination. And the racial world is highly sensitive to such charges, no matter how baseless.

Or if we admit Hawaii and refuse Puerto Rico or Guam or Samoa, there will be endless recriminations.

The founding fathers would never have believed the time would come when anyone would suggest that we incorporate into the Union isolated islands, 2,400 miles out in the ocean, consisting primarily of tropical, corporate plantations. There is only one logical place to stop. That is at the continental edge.

X. STATEHOOD ARGUMENTS

33. That Hawaii was promised statehood in 1898

Nothing that I can find indicates any promise of statehood in 1898. This rests purely on inferences, not actualities. The language of the treaty is quoted on page 13 of the House hearings:

"The Republic of Hawaii and the United States of America, in view of the natural dependence of the Hawaiian Islands upon the United States, of their geographical proximity thereto, of the predominant share acquired by the United States and its citizens in the industries and trade of said islands, and of the expressed desire of the government of Hawaii that those islands should be incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof, and under its sovereignty, have determined to accomplish by treaty an object so important to their mutual and permanent welfare."

That language makes very clear that the initiative was taken by the islands. Island leaders had fought for 7 years for annexation. On page 37 of the House hearings, ex-Delegate King recalls that his father and associates fought from 1893 to 1898 to this end.

It is true that the islands have proven to have great military value to the United States. But the partnership has not been one-sided. The very existence of the islands, their prosperity and growth, has rested on the United States. That the statehood proponents should seek to produce the impression that the islands have been defrauded for 50 years of their birthright is without the slightest justification.

It may be true that Senator Morgan of Alabama thought statehood would come soon. In defeating the Platt amendment, Congress doubtless refused to say Hawaii would not become a State. But that is no evidence that statehood was promised. Undoubtedly, in the "imperial" ideas that followed the Spanish War, some politicians dreamed of the Philippines becoming an integral part of the United States. If so, we wisely changed our minds before it was too late.

Some lawyers look into very odd corners for precedents. Because the Supreme Court has said that statehood usually follows a Territorial status, does not compel America to this as universal procedure. Congress would have little discretion if such reasoning were valid.

34. *Phrases that require analysis*

Popular appeal for statehood rests largely on certain short phrases: "No taxation without representation," "Second-class citizens," "Inferior status," "They have waited long enough."

None of these have any real validity. They do not apply properly to the issue at all. To rely on them is not statesmanship.

The citizens of Hawaii are, in reality, favored citizens. They are neither "second class" nor "inferior." Essentially they have their own government now. Their very life is based on the admission of their sugar and pineapples to the mainland market duty-free, to the sugar bonus or benefit of \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 a year received in addition; to the vast military expenditures in the islands of the Army and Navy.

The people hardest hit by taxes rarely have much to say about what they shall be. Taxes are placed where they will produce the least "squeal." That is why we raise so much of our revenue from corporation taxes, graduated income taxes, and luxury taxes. Corporations get no sympathy and high-bracket income earners have few votes. Indirect taxes are safe because, though the masses pay them, they do it unconsciously in the goods they buy. In actuality, "No taxation without representation" is, indeed, what Mr. Walter Dillingham calls an "old saw." It served as a rallying cry at the Boston Tea Party. In the Hawaiian matter it is being used as a red rag to the thoughtless.

35. *Heroic Japanese regiments*

It has been a relief to all to know that the Hawaiian-Japanese were not militarily disloyal. The superb fighting of Nisei regiments in Italy merits the deep appreciation of every American.

But statehood is not a proper method of expressing that appreciation. The Russians, too, fought bravely in the common cause. So did the troops of India, Australia, and New Zealand. But—even if they wished it—it would not follow that those countries should thereby have earned American statehood.

The people of Japan are charming, modest, brave, industrious. Their babies, though far too numerous, are a delight. The Germans, too, are resourceful, inventive, companionable, capable of great endurance. The Italians are hard-working, fun-loving, artistic, musical. But again—even if they wished it—these facts would have no proper part in our deciding on their coming in as States.

Statehood to islands means fundamentally altering the base structure of American government. Repeatedly using as an argument Japanese military service, is primarily an attempt to confuse the issues.

36. *Gallup polls, editorials, resolutions*

On simple, well-understood issues, Gallup polls are valuable. But in this instance the people can scarcely have any real knowledge. My own ignorance was complete up to last January. I should doubtless have voted favorably had I been questioned. Since I have been engaged in this study, I have ventured to question friends who normally are well informed on public issues. Practically without exception, their ignorance is all but complete on this subject.

It is my belief that editorial writers likewise have not given this the high measure of study and thought required. It would take weeks for them to have secured and related the material presented in outline in this memorandum. If any single editorial writer in the United States has done that, I should be exceedingly surprised.

Resolutions are always easy to obtain. Everybody is busy. Someone is primed to offer a resolution. It is assumed he knows all about it. Nobody else does. The body thereupon eloquently "resolves."

And, after reading their respective letters, I am convinced that the several Secretaries of the Interior have been equally lacking in a study of this. Secretary Ickes wrote the first letter, and Secretaries Krug and Chapman have followed his lead. They do not touch at all on the major factors which I discuss above. They confine themselves to whether or not Hawaii is "ready" for statehood, simply taking it for granted that that is the only issue.

XI. ON HEARINGS BY THE CONGRESS

37. The major hearings should be in the United States not in Honolulu

Initiating statehood on offshore islands is a revolutionary change for the United States. It should be considered by something in the nature of a carefully organized convention, like that which gave us the American Constitution.

The facts about Hawaii are very material, but only after and if this Nation has decided to spread statehood to offshore islands, and thereby change its fundamental character. To give so much attention to a local, costly, and highly organized propaganda machine, like that set up to promote statehood for Hawaii, is like delegating tariff making on steel to the corporations selfishly interested.

It is indeed a remarkable procedure to send small subcommittees on hurried 5- or 10-day trips to Honolulu, to listen there to carefully sifted proponents, reports, and figures, and upon these impressions to remove the limits of statehood from continental America.

Of course, we ought not to incorporate Hawaii unless its people are willing and ready. To that end a plebiscite is valuable, if uninhibited. But the overwhelmingly important criterion is what is best for the United States.

38. The hearings of the House committee

Perhaps I am an idealist. But to me the statehood issue appears an exceedingly important public trust. In matters of such transcendent moment Congress must be the trustee for the American people. Under the committee system the Congress must rely on its major committees and these, in turn, on subcommittees to search out patiently and without fear or favor the truth of an issue for the Nation.

What happened in Hawaii? I had not realized that lobbying groups, in questions of this sort, paid for long trips by congressional committees. Yet, if I understand the words of Delegate Farrington on page 305 of the House hearings, the expenses of this committee were paid by the Hawaiian Legislature. I quote his language:

"The legislature likewise provided Territorial funds to defray the expenses of the Members of Congress who were invited here to study our conditions. The members of this committee are traveling under the provisions of that law."

In such circumstances a committee should use extraordinary care to avoid partiality. In Hawaii, however, the proceedings appear to have been unbalanced. Ninety percent of the record is filled with prostatehood material. The effect produced is that the committee had come to Honolulu for the express purpose of giving the organized proponents a chance to publicize and file their material. And the fearful opponents? By advertisement they were directed to "File by Saturday night if you'd talk on statehood." And with whom were they to file? With the attorney general of the Territory, described by one witness (p. 246) as "known to be rabid on the subject of Hawaiian statehood."

The committee had little time. They were compelled to get back to more important business. Theoretically all witnesses were limited. But because the affirmative was well-organized, and divided up its presentation, it did not suffer from being cut off. Only two or three really effective witnesses appeared in opposition. One would have thought the committee, in common fairness, would have given them every chance to be heard. On the contrary the way Mr. Stokes was hurried (p. 242) and Mr. Alan cut off (p. 253, 254) does not reflect happily on the proceeding. I quote a few words:

Mr. ALAN. (254) "I learned too late to do a third writing that we antistatehooders were going to be restricted to a short time for our presentations, due to

the proponents taking too much of the visiting committee's time, some through long dissertations, some through error, unwitting or otherwise. * * *

Representative ANGELL. "We have limited all witnesses where they have long, prepared statements and put them in the record, and asked them to hit the high points, because the committee has very limited time, due to the fact that the Congress reconvenes on the 14th, and we have to get back. * * *

Delegate FARRINGTON. (p. 258) "I might say, in connection with the remarks of the previous witness, that I did my best to arrange for this committee to remain in the islands at least 3 weeks, so that there couldn't be any question about the amount of time that would be allowed for hearings. But in view of the pressure of other responsibilities, it is impossible for them to do so."

39. *Leading questions*

Such an inquiry should certainly be completely neutral. The committee in such case is a quasi-judicial body. The House resolution under which they acted (p. 2 of House hearings) directs them to "conduct a study of the various questions and problems." Surely such "study" should be made with an open mind and impartially.

Instead of this I find a singular lack of judicial attitude. Time and again one or another member argues with an opponent of statehood, or goes out of his way to act as an assistant to Delegate Farrington in bringing out the favorable phases of the testimony. The impression I get from reading is that they were prostatehood from the start. I mention some of the pages from which I derive that impression: 28, 29, 44, 292, 344, 345, 349, 385, 386, 390, 391, 429, 431, 432, 504, 505.

It is my conclusion that neither the time available, the sponsorship of the trip and the payment of expenses, nor the attitude of the committee augured favorably for a judicial examination of the profound questions involved.

40. *The Senate hearings*

The Senate hearings were unbiased and fair. However, even these were limited in time. Out of 96 Senators, few have been able to give it much attention.

Senator Cordon finally went alone to ask questions and spent, even then, only 5 days there. Nothing reveals more clearly how little time overburdened Senators have been able to give to this than Senator Cordon's opening words at the Honolulu hearings:

"This is a most difficult chore that I have had to undertake alone. We did everything possible to secure the attendance of more Members of the Senate at this investigation. Perhaps I should say exploration. It was simply impossible. Every Member of that body had half a dozen mortgages on his time."

41. *Senator Butler's report*

In my judgment Senator Butler pursued the only possible method of getting at many of the real facts. Being gravely disturbed by the reported fears described under my next heading, he avoided public hearings. Like Senator Cordon he went alone. Other Senators were again too busy. He reached Honolulu October 30, 1948, and held 77 confidential interviews, records of which were kept for the committee alone. In addition he talked personally with over 100 citizens whose remarks were not made a matter of record, even of confidential record.

While his report dealt only with communism, it is a convincing document. Nothing I can say would add even slightly to its force. I cannot believe that the Senate will disregard it. How the House could overwhelmingly vote for the statehood bill, with Senator Butler's report before it, passes my imagination.

42. *A community living in fear*

Fears do not make for sound democracy. And, if there be one thread that runs through the entire printed hearings, it is that the opposition is afraid to testify. The opposition is very real. Even in the chamber of commerce secret ballot (p. 415, House hearings) 170 voted in opposition. But few, if any, of these came before the congressional committees.

The reasons are not far to seek. Hawaii is 2,400 miles out in the ocean. It is expensive to move one's family back to the mainland and start all over again there, even if one had as good a job in sight or an equally successful business. Politicians fear votes. Businessmen fear boycotts. Employees fear loss of job, or demotion. On page 285 of the Cordon hearings, Mr. Charles M. Hite, speaking for statehood and the Democratic committee, says:

"I know and I know Mr. Burns (Republican chairman) knows, too, in all probability, of various influential witnesses you have had who, in my private home were violently against statehood, who have appeared up here and given you statements for it."

The fact that Senator Butler, meeting privately with 177 persons in all, could find widespread opposition, while the opposition testimony at public hearings was exceedingly scant, is sufficient proof. (See also pp. 245 and 246 of the House hearings.)

Whom do they fear? Some fear the Big Five. Some fear the Communists. Some fear bloc voting. Some fear the Japanese in a much wider sense. No one dared organize the opposition witnesses. Of those who were trained to organize their thinking and speak forcefully, there were only a half dozen. In the appendix I am calling attention to some of these courageous citizens, in and out of Hawaii, whose words should be read and pondered.

Fear of the Big Five.—In any community men hesitate to publicly oppose the dominant financial group. To be against what their fellow citizens call "progress" is not popular and often not safe. On a remote island, with financial power highly concentrated and employment interrelated, it is safer to swim with the current. There are not too many jobs. After all a man's family must eat. (See p. 503 of House hearings.)

Fear of the Communists.—Clearly the western world fears communism. Underground, sinister, unscrupulous, with the secret police just around the corner and no one knowing but his neighbor may belong, or later on his children be taught to spy on him, with Jack W. Hall boasting that his group controls Hawaii, thoughtful men prefer to talk confidentially to Congressmen and Senators, rather than in public hearings. And they feel safer as a Territory under the direct sponsorship of the United States.

Fear of bloc voting.—Obviously the Japanese could control the voting in Hawaii if they were to vote as a bloc. Normally they have not done so. Usually, rather than concentrate on a Japanese candidate as such, they have preferred one of another race who was notably friendly to them. The optimists whistle in the dark and are assured there will never be bloc voting. The pessimists are not so sure. Clever demagogues can organize the Japanese as voters, just as Harry Bridges and Jack W. Hall have come to control the labor force.

The fear of the Japanese.—Whether or not the fear of the Japanese be justified, it is undoubtedly very real and widespread. It constantly appears as one reads the hearings. Ex-Delegate King refers to it on page 37 of the House hearings.

"On the other hand there are the apprehensions of those who sincerely feel we have too large a population of one group—the Japanese group. I have never agreed with them."

On page 244 Mr. John F. G. Stokes says:

"During this election, also, candidates from both parties devoted much time to declaring their love for the Japanese and very little time on the questions of government. * * * On the basis of the biennial gains or losses, estimates of the racial voting strength would be: * * * for 1956, * * * for the Nisei * * * 65,000; Caucasian 37,000; Hawaiian 24,000. Thus the probabilities are that by that year, the Nisei vote will either dominate the electorate, or will do so soon afterward.

"Thus will have been accomplished what the Government of Japan attempted toward the end of the nineteenth century, namely the control of Hawaii by Japanese. Then Japan poured into Hawaii her people in great numbers, over the protest of the Republic of Hawaii, and simultaneously demanded for them the Hawaiian franchise. Rejections by the Republic brought threats of war, averted only by our annexation to America."

Other phases of fear of the Japanese are developed by Senator Campbell on pages 484, 485, 486, and 487 of the House hearings. And the statement of Mr. Martin E. Alan on pages 568 to 573 is indicative of widespread fear from this source, whether it be justified or not.

* * * * *

So long as a large minority is sincerely opposed to statehood, even apart from all other considerations, Congress should not give approval. Only if statehood were so obviously an advantage that it was universally approved by all sincere Hawaiians, should it even be seriously thought of by the United States.

XII. CONCLUSIONS

43. *Later figures abundantly confirm the Hawaiian picture*

Rereading the above pages, I have wondered if they can possibly be true. The picture, even in these days of fear, is startling to a degree.

But yesterday, April 21, 1950, by miracle or coincidence, I received a letter from the Department of Labor in Washington. It not merely confirms my fears

but intensifies them. It contains what I did not previously have—a "break-down" of the current unemployment figures in Hawaii. The essence of that letter is this:

"The 33,500 Hawaiian unemployed in January has not greatly decreased. Strikingly the lack of jobs is not primarily among white war workers from the mainland, as I had supposed. These imported war workers, as their jobs have ended, have returned home. Instead, only about 15 percent of the unemployed are Caucasian. Roughly, 35 percent are Japanese, 25 percent Filipino, 14 percent Part-Hawaiian, 6 percent Chinese, etc.

"The bulk of the unemployed are island born; nearly nine-tenths have lived in Hawaii 15 years or more. About one-half of the job applicants are between 25 and 34 years of age; about one-fifth between 35 and 44; and a smaller proportion, 45 and over."

Which, being interpreted, to me means: The flood of oriental and Portuguese babies are gradually growing into the working force. The problem is on our doorstep now, not 14 years hence as I ventured to prophesy under heading 18 above. The tables on page 9 give total Hawaiian births in 20 years to be 214,520. The deaths in the same period have been in the neighborhood of 62,000. The surplus of births over deaths is not far from 152,500. Of these the oriental and Portuguese surplus is approximately nine-tenths or about 137,000.

In other words, in 20 years these groups have produced a surplus, either of young adults or children growing up into adulthood, of 137,000. Except as these are housewives, they are adding to the labor force many thousands a year and within a few years the male part of the entire 137,000 will be so added. The present 33,000 of unemployed are only a foretaste.

During the war and postwar years this excessive flood was overlooked. Everyone had a job. But now military and naval employment has been greatly reduced and the American taxpayer hopes for much more drastic decreases. Meantime the basic industries of the islands have not expanded. Even before 1929, when this 20-year period began, sugar had reached its peak. One House witness says sugar employed 54,000 in 1932 (compared with 28,500 now, of whom 4,000 are children, p. 705). The pineapple industry has grown materially, but is probably at its top. The Department of Labor letter says:

"Current employment in Federal facilities is estimated to be far above the prewar level. During the spring months, further losses in Navy installations, particularly in Oahu, were anticipated. Other industry expansions probably will be negligible."

I repeat—this is on our doorstep now. Not only does General MacArthur each year have 1,750,000 more mouths to feed in Japan from excessive births alone, but in Hawaii 137,000 are already born of excessively multiplying groups, growing into the labor force with no jobs in prospect. They must either starve, be fed as unemployed, or be moved to add to the unemployment on the mainland.

With deaths only about 3,000 a year, even if not a single additional child were to be born in the islands, it would take 30 to 40 years to restore the labor force to an employable balance, unless the total of employment can in some presently unknown manner be appreciably increased. And mechanization is more likely to decrease employment than to increase it.

44. *What can we learn from this dilemma?*

If cancer be discovered in time, its chance of being cured is vastly improved. Perhaps this calamity of overfecundity in the Hawaiian Islands can dramatize to us the flood of humanity that threatens all that is worthwhile in the world. In that event some good might come of it. The statehood agitation might prove the surgeon's knife that could have the world patient.

Widespread discussion in the Senate, in the press and on the radio, can reach the heart and thought of the world. If, through major publicity and headlines, the minds of statesmen everywhere can be focused on our excessive multiplication of human beings—to eat limited food from limited topsoil, maybe life can be saved from catastrophe.

45. *What should be done?*

1. It should be positively decided that American statehood will not be extended beyond continental United States.

2. By convention or conference at high levels, a more adequate form of self-government should be worked out, for offshore islands, which would meet every legitimate aspiration of the Hawaiian people.

3. Steps should be taken forthwith either to reduce excessive birth rates of groups or races, which by early marriage or too large families are unfairly multiplying their relative numbers, or to prevent their spread in North America.

4. Above all every imaginable step should be taken to make clear to the peoples everywhere that the basic source of much of the poverty, misery, and friction in the world is in the acute unbalance between birth rates and death rates, between people and food, between human need and the earth's topsoil.

46. *"Islands have limits"—Can the world understand?*

The gospel of balance is the need of the hour. It is very simple. Every man who is born must die. If too many are born, death comes that much sooner. This is inescapable.

On islands our finite minds can see the picture and the limitations. Ireland, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii are uniquely situated to convince man of the obvious. But in the long run nature's law of balance must be faced, not only by islands but even by the great river valleys of the earth—the Ganges, the Yangtse, and the Mississippi. It is simple arithmetic. Can it be made clear to human beings?

APPENDIX

The Japanese crisis—List of authorities

Japan's New Live Weapon, United Nations World, June 1949, p. 14.

Danger in Japan—Too Many People, United States News and Weekly Report, September 9, 1949, p. 26.

Pressure of Numbers in Japan, London Economist, June 11, 1949, p. 1096.

The Problem of Japan, Current Affairs No. 91, October 15, 1949.

No Room to Live in Japan, America, May 28, 1949, p. 284.

Factors on Japanese Population, American Sociological Review, February 1950.

Need for a Population Policy in Japan, same magazine.

Control of Human Fertility in Japan, also in same magazine.

The world crisis in general

Aiding Underdeveloped Areas Abroad; 22 articles in March 1950, number of Annals of Political Science.

Food and Agricultural publications of United Nations.

Statistical Year Book of United Nations.

Speech by Sir Herbert Broadley, FAO, August 18, 1949.

Road to Survival by William Vogt.

World birth and death rates, etc.

Population Problems, by Warren S. Thompson.

Plenty of People, by Warren S. Thompson.

Population, by A. M. Carr-Saunders.

Population figures

World Almanac.

Canadian Yearbooks.

United States Census Figures.

Statistical Abstracts.

Hawaiian figures

Hearings and reports, House and Senate committees.

Board of health reports.

Annual reports of the Governor.

United States Census reports.

Town Meeting radio program of October 4, 1949.

Hawaii and Statehood, Statehood Commission.

Manual of Hawaiian Securities.

Newspaper clippings, Honolulu press, January 1950.

Important testimony and statements on statehood

William M. Chadbourne, Senate hearings, p. 478.

Edward R. Lewis, Senate hearings, pp. 480, 481.

Walter F. Dillingham, Senate hearings, pp. 289, 401.

Senator Alice Kamokila Campbell, House hearings, p. 481 et seq.

Martin E. Alan, House hearings, pp. 253, 568.

John F. G. Stokes, House hearings, pp. 241 et seq.

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT ON HAWAIIAN EMPLOYMENT

Today, May 3, 1950, I am in receipt of an airmail letter, enclosing a release by the Territory of Hawaii Employment Service, for February and March. These figures only emphasize what is noted on page 28 of my original memorandum.

Unemployment has dropped slightly, due in major part to "continued large-scale departure from the islands." But it is still 15.6 percent of the labor force. The basic industries, sugar and pineapple, only account for 31,674 employees, as follows:

Sugar :	
Mills.....	8, 642
Agriculture.....	13, 995
Total.....	22, 637
Pineapples :	
Canneries.....	5, 658
Agriculture.....	3, 379
Total.....	9, 037
Total (both).....	31, 674

Comparing this total in the two basic industries, with the other major employment items, shows how limited this is, compared with the secondary industries or employment:

Unemployed.....	29, 985	Other agriculture.....	7, 504
Federal Government.....	17, 815	Communications.....	1, 624
Local government.....	13, 975	Other utilities.....	1, 832
Wholesale and retail.....	25, 869	Finance, insurance.....	3, 384
Service.....	14, 734	Total.....	160, 188
Self-employed.....	12, 168	Sugar and pineapples.....	31, 674
Construction.....	8, 193	Total labor force.....	191, 862
Transportation.....	7, 865		
Domestics.....	6, 725		
Other manufacture.....	8, 515		

Federal employment, 64,500 in the spring of 1945, is now down to 17,815; a drop of 46,685. From January 1, 1946, when it was 52,200, it is down 34,385. Local government has added 1,175 to its numbers since January 1, 1946, and 2,650 have been added to domestic employment, for example: "wholesale and retail" is 2,869 higher; construction has added 1,593, etc. Secondary employment is likely to contract much more.

On page 28 of my memorandum, I estimated 137,000 additions by births over deaths in 20 years, who would gradually come into the labor force. This employment report confirms this, as follows:

"The labor force will increase considerably in June when 6,000 youths graduate from local high schools, vocational schools, and the university."

As one instance of further contraction of jobs due to mechanization, the report says (dealing with the island of Hawaii):

"Introduction of bulk sugar handling and loading has reduced the number of workers needed and further reductions are anticipated."

Senator BUTLER. Mr. Churchill has asked that I give Senators Cordon and Morse a copy, which I did a day or two ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Your request for permission to revise and extend your remarks of course is granted.

Now, does anybody else care to have any statement?

Mr. FARRINGTON. In conclusion, I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that we are more than grateful to you and the members of the committee for the great consideration that we have been shown. We are full of aloha to all of you.

The CHAIRMAN. And aloha nui-aloa to you.

The committee is very grateful to Delegate Farrington and to all who have been associated with him and to all other witnesses for the

extreme care and thoughtfulness with which the case has been presented.

We will rely, Mr. Silverman, very heavily upon you and upon the Department of the Interior in the further consideration of these two statehood matters.

I wish to announce before the conclusion of the session that it will be of the utmost importance to members of the committee in the consideration of the problems that the record be completed. Delay in filing additional material will only serve to delay the final consideration. So let me express the hope that all persons who have been accorded permission to insert any new material or to revise or extend their remarks will do so promptly. We are most anxious indeed to have a complete printed record for the consideration of the committee. Certainly that will be necessary if the bills should get on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. FARRINGTON. We understand the importance of that and the significance of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Nobody else desiring to make any representations, the Chair will now declare these hearings concluded.

(Whereupon, at 12:15 p. m., the hearings were concluded.)

APPENDIX

COMMUNICATIONS FROM FEDERAL AND STATE OFFICIALS, HAWAIIAN CIVIC GROUPS,
MISCELLANEOUS ORGANIZATIONS, AND OTHERS, TOGETHER WITH NEWSPAPER
CLIPPINGS

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 5, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I am highly gratified by the thorough and objective consideration which your committee is giving to H. R. 331 and H. R. 49, bills which would enable the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii to take their rightful place as members of the Union. As you know, I have long supported the objectives of these important bills which carry out the pledges made to the people of the two Territories. I sincerely hope that the Congress, during its present session, will enact legislation granting statehood to Alaska and Hawaii. The need is more urgent today than ever before. By such action, we will not only promote the welfare and development of the two Territories, but also greatly strengthen the security of our Nation as a whole.

It should not be forgotten that most of our present States achieved statehood at a relatively early period of their development. The stimulus of being admitted as full partners in the Union, and the challenge of managing their own affairs, were among the most significant factors contributing to their growth and progress. Very few of our existing States, at the times of their admission to the Union, possessed potential resources, both human and natural, superior to those of Alaska and Hawaii. I am confident that Alaska and Hawaii, like our present States, will grow with statehood and because of statehood.

There is no necessity for me to repeat at this time the arguments for statehood. The many qualified witnesses who have appeared before your committee have, I am sure, presented convincing evidence both as to the need for and the tangible benefits to be derived from statehood. There is, however, one objection made by opponents of H. R. 331 and H. R. 49 which I believe requires further discussion because it goes beyond the question of statehood and raises a fundamental constitutional issue. I am referring to the objection that Alaska and Hawaii as States would be entitled to representation in the Senate of the United States disproportionate to their population.

This argument is not only entirely without merit, but also directly attacks a basic tenet of the constitutional system under which this Nation has grown and prospered. Without the provision for equal representation in the Senate of all States, both great and small, regardless of population, there probably would have been no United States. This was one of the great compromises which the Federalist says was a result "not of theory, but of a spirit of amity, and that mutual deference and concession which the peculiarity of our political situation rendered indispensable." There is no justification for denying statehood to Alaska and Hawaii on the basis of an issue which was resolved by the Constitutional Convention in 1787.

America justly takes pride in its record of fulfilling to the letter its obligations to foreign nations. We should be no less scrupulous in carrying out the promises made to our own citizens in Alaska and Hawaii. The case for statehood rests on both legal and moral grounds.

These are troubled times. I know of few better ways in which we can demonstrate to the world our deep faith in democracy and the principle of self-government than by admitting Alaska and Hawaii to the Union as the forty-ninth and fiftieth States.

Sincerely,

(Signed) HARRY S. TRUMAN.

519

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., May 3, 1950.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,

*Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

Urge immediate passage of Hawaii and Alaska statehood bills. Hawaii and Alaska represent outer defenses of west coast and all other arguments fade away when we face that uncontrovertible fact. They are the bulwark between the mainland and enemy invasion. Those outer defenses will be much better manned when they become full-fledged States and it is imperative to our security that west-coast defenses are immediately and strongly built up. I take issue with position that Hawaii is bad risk because of alleged subversive infiltration. We have Communists at home, too. Territory or State, the infiltration of Hawaii by subversive elements is real danger to our security. When Hawaii gains statehood we will be in much stronger position to weed out these traitors.

RICHARD NIXON,

Member of Congress, Twelfth District of California.

STATE OF UTAH,

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,

Salt Lake City, March 22, 1950.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,

*United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I was interested and pleased to read that the House of Representatives approved the legislation which provides statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. It is my understanding that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which you are a member, now has this legislation under consideration. I trust it will be reported out favorably.

It has long been my conviction that both Alaska and Hawaii have earned their right to become States. As Territories of the United States of America, they have demonstrated, in numerous ways, their qualifications for statehood. They now deserve to be given the statehood they have sought for so many years, and with the opportunity to govern themselves.

The United States of America has long been the champion of self-determination and government of the people, by the people, and for the people. It now can show the nations of the world that it has kept faith with the principles it has advocated over the years. I sincerely hope, therefore, that the Senate committee will act favorably on the statehood legislation for both Alaska and Hawaii.

Respectfully yours,

J. BRACKEN LEE, *Governor.*

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL,

Carson City, Nev., May 1, 1950.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,

*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular
Affairs, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: My attention has been directed to the fact that public hearings upon statehood bills begin today before your committee.

I am taking the liberty of calling the attention of your committee to a resolution passed at the last annual meeting of our national association in St. Paul.

I would very much appreciate having you insert in the record this letter, as well as the accompanying resolution.

My regards.

Very truly yours,

ALAN BIBLE, *President.*

IX. STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Whereas the Pacific frontiers of this Nation now lie in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the patriotism and loyalty of the citizens of these Territories has manifested itself in the sacrifice and toil of these peoples for the common welfare of the United States; and

Whereas these Territories deserve admission to the Union and, by right, ought properly to be members of this Union: Be it

Resolved, That we favor the immediate admission to statehood of the Territory of Alaska and the Territory of Hawaii.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
San Francisco, Calif., April 28, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular
Affairs, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: It has been brought to my attention that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will on Monday, May 1, initiate public-health hearings related to the question of the admission of Hawaii to statehood.

As president of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers I should like to go on record as favoring statehood for Hawaii. The public-health problems in Hawaii are capably handled by the Hawaiian Department of Public Health, and from this standpoint there is every reason for such a step at this time.

I sincerely hope that this communication may be inserted into the Record.

Very sincerely yours,

WILTON L. HALVERSON, M. D.,
Director of Public Health.

HONOLULU, April 29, 1950.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D. C.*

In my unavoidable absence from the Hawaii delegation appearing before your committee, may I in this wise supplement my previous appeals for recognition by your committee of the justice of Hawaii's claim to statehood.

As mayor of the city and county of Honolulu, I wish to extend my thanks for the prompt calling of this hearing before your committee and renew my plea for favorable action by the committee on Hawaii's appeal for autonomy with the other States of the Union, and, in the name of the people of Honolulu, I ask that this communication be made a part of the record of your committee's deliberations.

JOHN H. WILSON, *Mayor.*

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, T. H., April 24, 1950.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is with considerable interest the American Legion of Hawaii notes that hearings before your committee for admission of the Territory of Hawaii into the family of States are scheduled to commence on May 1.

We solicit favorable action of your committee with the assurance that the American Legion of Hawaii will be ever present in preserving the traditions of our democratic form of government and our American way of life.

We ask your committee's earnest consideration and unanimous approval of H. R. No. 49.

Respectfully yours,

ARLEIGH J. FONNER,
Department Commander.

THE HONOLULU COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Honolulu 17, T. H., April 4, 1950.

SENATOR JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

GENTLEMEN: The Honolulu Council of Churches has empowered me, its president, to write your committee stating that the Honolulu Council of Churches, representing about 100 Protestant organizations in this city, is in favor of statehood for Hawaii. We would like to have this letter of approval entered in the hearings which you will soon hold with regard to this important question.

Respectfully yours,

HAROLD W. KENT,
President, Honolulu Council of Churches.

THE YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION,
Honolulu 9, T. H., May 1, 1950.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: It is our understanding that hearings are soon to be held on the pending measure which would give statehood to the Territory of Hawaii.

The board of directors of the YMCA of Honolulu at a meeting April 20, 1950, went on record as fully supporting the current bill which would provide statehood for Hawaii and asked that this expression of their judgment and action be forwarded to you.

Directors of the Honolulu YMCA represent eight community branch YMCA's located in various sections of the island of Oahu and are therefore an excellent cross section of the business and community leadership of the city and county of Honolulu.

We know that you will give complete consideration to this important question and hope that your decision will favor statehood for this Territory.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY G. ELLIS,
General Secretary.

ZONTA CLUB OF HONOLULU, T. H.,
April 25, 1950.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SIR: The Honolulu Zonta Club wishes to reiterate their affirmative stand on statehood for Hawaii.

The people of Hawaii are ready and eager for full citizenship in the United States of America. At the recent constitutional-convention election 80 percent of the voting public went to the polls.

No wonder the people of Hawaii are anxiously awaiting the report of your committee. Over 50 years is a long time to wait.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH ST. JOHN
Mrs. Harold St. John,
Secretary.

MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED BY SENATOR HUGH BUTLER

(The attached is the record of an interview with a well-known Hawaiian dentist of Japanese ancestry, a Democrat, and a strong supporter of statehood. The interview is presented for the record because it gives some light on the tendency of those of Japanese ancestry in the islands to accept the Communist propaganda line.)

HARRY I. KURISAKI

(An interview conducted by Oscar G. Iden, member of the staff of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on Friday, November 5, 1948, in the Iolani Palace, Honolulu, T. H.)

MR. IDEN. Would you state your name for the record?

MR. KURISAKI. My name is Harry I. Kurisaki.

MR. IDEN. You are a practicing dentist in the islands.

MR. KURISAKI. Yes. I have practiced dentistry for the last 31 years. I am a graduate of the University of Southern California in 1917.

MR. IDEN. Your birthday?

MR. KURISAKI. Hamakua, Hawaii, January 3, 1893.

MR. IDEN. I do not know any better way, Doctor, than to just let you go ahead and say anything that you might care to that would help us in this matter that we are trying to consider, and, as your story unfolds, some questions may occur to us and you can speak freely.

MR. KURISAKI. I do not know just what you want and what nature—

MR. IDEN. Suppose first I ask you your position on statehood for the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. KURISAKI. Naturally I am for statehood, because I believe in progressiveness, and any government should progress, and the next step would be statehood for us. I cannot see anything right at present to prevent us from getting that statehood outside of what the people might say, the Communist infiltration, but even at that I have very little doubt whether this place has more Communists than any other mainland State.

I can grant you that this place is much more fertile ground than other parts of the United States for Communists to work on.

Mr. IDEN. Well, it might not be a bad idea to take it up from there and tell us why you feel it is more fertile ground.

Mr. KURISAKI. This is my own personal opinion, after seeing so many of the boys of Japanese extraction members of the so-called Communists. I am not certain as far as membership, but through what I heard that they are members. At the beginning I thought it was on account of the number that we have so many young Japanese in comparison with the other races, so naturally you have more in proportion. But after I saw in the paper about this instructor in the University of Hawaii, Fujimoto, he openly turned to the Communists, I started to think a little bit, and the reason is that of course Hawaii, we have very little racial prejudice compared with the mainland, but still you cannot help having it, and I do not think that we can ever stop it just like you have prejudice against the Negro people in the mainland. On the surface you have equal treatment among Japanese and Chinese and Hawaiians and whites and things like that, but still you cannot deny that there is a certain amount of discrimination against citizens of oriental extraction.

For instance, like this fellow Fujimoto, he worked over there for quite a while at the university, and I think that he is qualified to be in the position, at least he would think so, that he is qualified to be in a little better position than where he was, until his resignation, and that always breeds discontentment, and naturally discontentment will fall easily to the propaganda of the Communist Party. After seeing Fujimoto turn Communist, I have a feeling the reason so many Japanese are turning to Communists is discontentment among this group, as far as treatment in attaining the position they think they are qualified for.

On top of that, if they are not educated, as many of the Negroes, they might not come to that, but they are being educated, educated enough to see those things, and not too much to realize the real value of them.

As I heard Monsignor Sheehan one time say, "Intelligentsia is over-educated people." Maybe they are in that status that they think that they are educated, but not enough educated to see the bad features of communism. So they fall easy prey to this propaganda, and I come to that understanding now. That is the reason why you see so many among the Communists who are Japanese, outside of the numerical population. The population of that group is more than the Chinese or the Hawaiian.

Mr. IDEN. Let me ask you a frank question. Is that vulnerability and willingness to accept the ideology of communism on the part of the people of Japanese ancestry in any way tied in with nationalistic views?

Mr. KURISAKI. The nationalistic view of the Japanese nations, you mean.

Mr. IDEN. Yes.

Mr. KURISAKI. I do not think so, because you know from the policy of the Japanese Government, they were very much against communistic ideas, and that is one thing that brought about this war with China and all of the war that Japan was in, I think through the effort of the Communists to shut out foreign ideas. They have a separate ideology of what you might call emperor worship, and I do not think that it is the cause.

Mr. IDEN. Do you feel that the approach that the Communists are using in the development of the idea that the Japanese people are being discriminated against by other racial groups?

Mr. KURISAKI. I think that that is right.

Mr. IDEN. By other economic groups?

Mr. KURISAKI. I think the propaganda tactics are based on that discrimination theory. I think that if you would have communism here, then you would all be treated alike, or in fact better than the other race; I think that dissatisfaction is the thing that they are stressing.

Mr. IDEN. They are trying to develop the idea that the Japanese people are a sort of "have-not" group in the islands?

Mr. KURISAKI. I believe so. They are trying to instill that idea in them.

Mr. IDEN. That then would go back somewhat traditionally, would it not, to the economy of the islands?

Mr KURISACKI. Traditionally to the economy of the islands?

Mr. IDEN. Traditionally to the attitude of the Japanese population, we will say, in 1920 or 1930, that there was a definite feeling that they were being discriminated against by, we will say, the Big Five, or the business interests, or the economic interests.

Mr. KURISACKI. Yes. Well, I think that they were discriminated, more so, but they did not realize it until the Democratic administration came into the United States, until Roosevelt came in and then after giving lots of rights which rightfully belonged to the lower strata people, then they started to realize. Until then I do not think that they knew anything about it. I think that gave them the idea that they are entitled to more than those economically favored groups. Formerly, as you know, the Japanese plantation workers conducted two major strikes here, and the leaders were put in jail or sent away from here, and they did not think much about it, or that they were wrong, being a leader to instill troubles like that in the islands, so naturally they thought it was right on the part of the Government to do that. After the bargaining rights and unionizing rights were given to the laborers, then they started to see those things.

Another thing, the older people were Japanese people and the ones that you are talking of today are citizens mostly, educated in our schools, and they start to see it in that light. Therefore, I believe when you give them a little, they want a little more, and the Communists would tell them that they can have more by doing this, and naturally they fall for it.

Mr. IDEN. Do you believe that the Communists are approaching the Japanese because they are Japanese or because they feel that they can reach a group which has a definite feeling of inferiority in the face of the other groups?

Mr. KURISACKI. I do not think that they are reaching the Japanese exclusively with that idea, but among these laborers here you would see more young Japanese boys within that group, like the stevedoring union, or the plantation group, and you would see more Japanese there, and they are more educated than the Filipinos or a few Chinese, or the little Puerto Ricans that are left, and the Spanish and the Portuguese. You can see the bulk of them and naturally they become the leaders of the organization. Consequently, I think the propagandists laid more stress on them to win over these few leaders they have and try to work it through that way.

ANN ARBOR, MICH., April 28, 1950.

SENATOR JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,

Chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee:

University of Hawaii Club went on record favoring immediate statehood for Hawaii. Urges your committee to report bill out favorably.

YUKIO NAITO, *President.*

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington 5, D. C., April 6, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,

*Chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Referring to the question of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, which matters I understand are to come up before your committee on April 24 for Alaska and on May 1 for Hawaii, I take pleasure in handing you herewith a true copy of a resolution adopted at the 1949 national convention of the American Legion, held on Philadelphia, Pa., August 29-September 1, 1949.

You will note that this resolution urges Congress to admit these Territories to statehood.

We would deeply appreciate your favorable consideration of this resolution when the matter comes before your honorable body.

Thanking you for your courtesy, and trusting you can see your way clear to vote in favor of admitting these Territories to statehood, I am

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY, *Director.*

COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS: STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Whereas the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii are necessary for our defense as our western outposts of the United States; and

Whereas in the event of another attack on this country, Alaska and Hawaii will again be among the first areas under attack—"Their defense will be our defense"; and

Whereas the admission of said Territories to statehood would expedite their development and the completion of proper preparedness measures in those vital areas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion in national convention assembled at Philadelphia Pa., August 29 to September 1, 1949, urge the Congress of the United States to admit said Territories to statehood.

AMVETS,

Washington, D. C., May 2, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,

*Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: This is to advise you that the AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II) national convention of 1949 adopted a resolution supporting the admission of Hawaii into the Union of the United States. It is the conviction of the AMVETS that Hawaii has satisfactorily served its apprenticeship for statehood and should be recognized as an equal member of this great United States. The strategic position of Hawaii was demonstrated in World War II and it continues to be an outpost of American democracy.

Kindly submit this letter to your committee for incorporation with the testimony by the committee on the admission of Hawaii into the United States.

Very truly yours,

MARVIN L. GOLDBERGER,
National Legislative Director.

CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS,
MONROE COUNTY CHAPTER,
Rochester, N. Y., March 18, 1950.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
*United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.*

GENTLEMEN: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution which was unanimously adopted at a recent meeting of the Monroe County Chapter, Catholic War Veterans. I trust that this will be given due consideration by the committee.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS H. SPIEGEL, *Adjutant.*

RESOLUTION URGING ADMISSION OF ALASKA AND HAWAII AS STATES

Whereas a bill granting statehood to Hawaii and Alaska is now before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and

Whereas this bill was passed by the House on March 3, 1950; and

Whereas both Hawaii and Alaska want statehood and the United States needs Hawaii and Alaska to advance her defense, sustain her security, and discharge her deep moral obligation; and

Whereas there should be no delay for the reason that delay weakens our Pacific security; and

Whereas it is no secret that Russia claims Alaska actually belongs to her, and is only biding a suitable time to take it back: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Monroe County Chapter, Catholic War Veterans, urges immediate action on this measure to admit Hawaii and Alaska as States into the Union.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
NATIONAL SERVICE HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1950.

The Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: H. R. 49, a bill to enable Hawaii to become a State, was passed by the House of Representatives by an overwhelming majority last March, and is now pending before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The Disabled American Veterans desires to be recorded in favor of H. R. 49, and to urge its early enactment.

Our organization's position is based upon resolutions adopted at our four immediate past national conventions favoring the inclusion of Hawaii as the forty-ninth State. This mandate was approved by DAV delegates to those four national conventions from all sections of the United States.

The arguments for and against statehood for Hawaii have been thoroughly discussed during the past 17 years. To review them in detail would occupy too much of the time of your committee. However, we of the DAV believe the vote of the House of Representatives last March, in passing H. R. 49 by such an overwhelming majority, is a reflection of the majority American public opinion that Hawaii should be admitted into the Union. Hawaii proved its gallantry in the last war. It has the necessary population to warrant representation in Congress. Its financial background has been stable in the satisfactory upkeep of her own government and people.

We respectfully urge that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs act favorably upon H. R. 49 at an early date. It would be appreciated if this communication is made part of the printed hearings.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
National Legislative Director.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
March 29, 1950.

Re H. R. 331 and H. R. 49.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: This is to advise you of the position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States with respect to the above captioned bills which would authorize statehood for the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, respectively. As you know, both bills were approved by a wide margin in the House of Representatives.

For several years the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in annual national encampments, has adopted resolutions endorsing statehood for the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. Such action was reaffirmed through resolution No. 300 at the 1949 national encampment held in Miami, Fla., in August of that year.

It has long been the considered judgment of the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that the people of these two Territories are entitled to the benefits and prestige of statehood. In addition, the question of national security is involved, particularly with respect to Alaska. The people of these two Territories have served an adequate apprenticeship as organized Territories and are fully qualified to meet the obligation of statehood.

On behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars may I strongly urge that these two bills be scheduled for early hearings and express the hope that the committee will promptly report the bills to the Senate for favorable action.

Respectfully yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM, *Director.*

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
New York 10, N. Y., April 26, 1950.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: May we express our very earnest appeal for favorable action after your hearings on statehood for Alaska and Hawaii?

Both these bills have our complete support.

We are familiar with the arguments against favorable action on the Hawaiian bill, but we think they are outweighed by the fact that Hawaii is really, in its institutions and attitudes, an integral part of the United States; communication is so rapid nowadays that no argument of distance should prevail. Nor does the racial composition of the island in any way detract from its thoroughgoing Americanism.

The United States should set an example in resisting influence by racial considerations, and should promptly admit Hawaii as a State of these United States.

Sincerely,

PATRICK MURPHY MALIN,
Director.
ARTHUR GARFIELD HAYS,
General Counsel.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR IDENTIFICATION,
Youngstown 2, Ohio, April 26, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The International Association for Identification assembled in their thirty-third annual convention held in Denver, Colo., on September 30, 1948, passed a resolution favoring statehood for Hawaii. A copy of this resolution is hereby enclosed.

I have received information that this bill is on the calendar for discussion before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs Monday May 1.

The approximately 2,000 members of this association are very interested in seeing Hawaii granted statehood.

With the very best of wishes to you, and hoping for your support for this bill, I am

Very respectfully yours,

LEROY GOODWIN,
Secretary and Treasurer.

RESOLUTION NO. 9—RESOLUTION FAVORING STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Whereas the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress of the United States, on June 30, 1947, passed H. R. 49, a bill introduced by Hon. Joseph R. Farrington, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and be admitted as a State in the American Union; and

Whereas this bill is now before the Senate of the Eightieth Congress of the United States; and,

Whereas the question presented to the American people by this bill is Hawaii's right to statehood now; and,

Whereas Hawaii was annexed as a Territory of the United States by mutual agreement between the former Republic of Hawaii and the United States, and such annexation has been of immeasurable value to the United States as well as the people of Hawaii; and,

Whereas Hawaii is only one of two Territories of the United States, the other 29 territories which have been organized in the history of the Union all having been admitted to statehood; and,

Whereas in the 49 years since annexation of Hawaii it has become a modern American community, with a sound economy and a healthy and literate people, who have shown themselves to be fully capable of self-government; and,

Whereas the people of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question their loyalty and patriotism to the Government of the United States, as found by the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives in March 1947, in a report concluding that: "The Committee on Public Lands is unanimously convinced

that the Territory of Hawaii has met every necessary requirement to be admitted as a State of the Union"; and,

Whereas the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior have unqualifiedly endorsed immediate statehood for Hawaii; and,

Whereas the International Association for Identification has previously gone on record as favoring immediate statehood for Hawaii; as has also International Association for Identification by its action in unanimously adopting a resolution favoring immediate statehood for Hawaii offered and adopted at its meeting held in Rochester, N. Y., in July 1946: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the International Association for Identification, That this organization does hereby reaffirm the action taken by said International Association for Identification in Rochester, N. Y., in July 1946; and urges the Senate of the Eightieth Congress of the United States to take immediate action to enable Hawaii to be admitted as a State; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Honorable Hugh Butler, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, to the Chairman of the Hawaii Statehood Commission.

Michael F. Morrissey, Chairman, Chicago, Ill.; Eric Ekebom, Rockford, Ill.; Walter C. Heitz, St. Louis, Mo.; George Kanz, Salem, Oreg.; Robert E. Moore, Detroit, Mich.; John F. O'Rourke, El Paso, Tex.; Robert Rose, Oconomowoc, Wis.; James O. Barker, Miami, Fla.; John F. Lynch, Springfield, Ill.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington 6, D. C., May 2, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*Chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
United States Senate, Washington 25, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: The Chamber of Commerce of the United States strongly recommends that Hawaii be granted statehood.

Therefore, the chamber hopes that your committee will give early approval to H. R. 49, the Hawaiian statehood bill. I would like to have you make this letter a part of the record of your hearings.

Cordially yours,

CLARENCE R. MILES.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REAL ESTATE BOARDS,
April 25, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Our association went on record at its convention in November 1949, favoring statehood for Hawaii.

I hope, therefore, that your committee will take favorable action.

Sincerely,

HERBERT U. NELSON,
Executive Vice President.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., May 1, 1950.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*

Information is that public hearing considering statehood for Hawaii starts May 1. Please be advised that the National Association of Sanitariums during the annual meeting held in Salt Lake City, Utah, September 1947, unanimously voted to go on record favoring statehood for Hawaii. That feeling is the same today.

ROSCOE C. DAVIS, *Executive Secretary.*

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., April 24, 1950.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*Chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs,
 United States Senate, Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: The National Education Association of the United States urges favorable action by your committee on the proposal to confer statehood upon Hawaii.

Hawaii has earned this recognition. Her people love freedom. They have developed a great school program to teach the meaning of freedom and the responsibilities of citizenship. Hawaii has made great progress in providing equality of educational opportunity for her youth. In this respect her record is the equal of, if not superior to, the record of any State in the Union.

The contribution made by Hawaii to the winning of World War II was of the highest significance. Today she stands a key outpost for freedom in the Pacific. Her location makes her an important factor upon which our national security heavily depends.

The loyalty of her citizens during recent critical years has been tested and found not wanting. Their courage is unchallenged. They are prepared for self-government. To extend to them the same privileges and duties which belong to the citizens of the States is to do no more than express our confidence in them and our own faith in the ideals for which our Nation stands.

In 1946 the National Education Association of the United States, in annual convention at Buffalo, N. Y., unanimously endorsed statehood for Hawaii. We believe that the time is appropriate for favorable action on the request of Hawaii to be admitted as a State.

For several years it was my privilege to be associated with the schools of the Territory of Hawaii as superintendent of public instruction. During recent years it was my opportunity to visit on several occasions in Hawaii. I am convinced on the basis of my personal knowledge that the people of Hawaii merit immediate, favorable action on the part of your committee and the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

WILLARD E. GIVENS,
Executive Secretary.

—
 LIONS INTERNATIONAL,
Chicago 4, Ill., May 2, 1950.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*United States Senator, Chairman,
 Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
 Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: This letter is written to you on behalf of the Lions of Hawaii who have asked that we send to you information concerning the action which was taken at our international convention in Philadelphia in 1946 and again at our international convention in New York in 1948, endorsing and supporting the move of Hawaii for admittance into statehood.

We understand that the House of Representatives has already passed the statehood bill and the question as to whether Hawaii will become a State immediately rests now with the Senate and that public hearings are taking place at the present time.

We are particularly interested in this matter because of the fact we have on our board of directors at this time a very fine Hawaiian, Henry A. Nye, of Honolulu. This is the first time, incidentally, in the 33 years of existence of this association that a Hawaiian has had a place on our international board.

A copy of the resolution passed at our 1948 convention in New York is attached, showing the action taken by our delegates, who were very enthusiastic about this proposal. We hope very much indeed for favorable consideration of this matter by your committee.

With best wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours,

MELVIN JONES, *Secretary General.*

RESOLUTION FAVORING STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Whereas Hawaii was annexed as a Territory of the United States by mutual agreement between the former Republic of Hawaii and the United States; and,

Whereas Hawaii is one of the 2 remaining incorporated Territories of the United States, the other 29 having long since been admitted to the Union, and it being well understood that Hawaii would be admitted as a State, the Territorial form of government being necessary only as the people of the Territory are capable of self-government; and

Whereas the people of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond any doubt to the United States their ability to govern themselves; and

Whereas the Congress' investigation of statehood for Hawaii in the year 1946-47 has recommended immediate statehood for Hawaii; and

Whereas the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior have endorsed immediate statehood for Hawaii; and

Whereas the convention of Lions International assembled in Philadelphia endorsed immediate statehood for Hawaii: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we as delegates to the international convention assembled in New York City on this the 29th day of July 1948, do hereby recommend immediate statehood for Hawaii and hereby go on record as favoring action by the Eighty-first Congress of the United States which would enable Hawaii to be admitted as a State; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the House Committee on Public Lands of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Governor of Hawaii, the Washington Hawaii Statehood Commission, to the International President of Lions International, and to the Officers of Lions International.

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S AND WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION,

Washington 4, D. C., May 1, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,

Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,

United States Senate, Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union is in favor of the speedy enactment of H. R. 49 providing for statehood for the Territory of Hawaii. This union and its many subsidiary bodies have been on record for statehood for many years.

I am enclosing a brief statement on behalf of the union, and I respectfully request that this letter and the enclosed statement be included in the record of the committee's hearings.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM GLAZIER,
Washington Representative.

STATEMENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S AND WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION

The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union is the collective-bargaining representative for practically all of the workers in the longshore, sugar, and pineapple industries of Hawaii.

This union is on record for the speedy enactment of statehood for Hawaii. We wish to take the occasion of these hearings to reiterate this position.

Various bodies of the union extending from local unions in Hawaii and on the mainland to the highest body, the biennial convention of the international union, have repeatedly gone on record endorsing statehood without delay.

The thousands of members of the ILWU who are residents of the Territory of Hawaii continue to be second-class American citizens who faithfully carry the full total of the duties and responsibilities of citizenship, while being denied many of the important rights of citizenship which we on the mainland enjoy as a matter of course.

We wish to make perfectly clear that our support of statehood is based solely upon the principles involved. We neither expect nor look for any special advantage to the union organization that will not be applied equally to all members of the Hawaiian community. We support statehood because it is clearly the aspiration of the overwhelming number of the people of Hawaii. It should not be denied any longer.

The support of the principle of statehood by the ILWU in no way indicates an endorsement of the ready-made constitution which is being drawn up by the present statehood convention. To the contrary, we cannot but believe that the unrepresentative character of the convention will inevitably result in a constitution which is not truly responsive to the needs of the working men and women in Hawaii.

Despite this reservation and despite our deep-felt conviction that some of the most outspoken "friends" of statehood by their actions are in fact destroying confidence in the ability of the people of Hawaii to exercise the rights of statehood, this union strongly reiterates its support of statehood legislation.

We feel that once enjoying the full power of statehood, the people of Hawaii will meet and solve their own problems by exercising the fullest democratic expression of their own convictions.

Previous hearings on statehood have heard spokesmen of the ILWU develop our position on this vital matter. We do not feel that the present record need be encumbered by repeating this testimony, and request only that all earlier statements, resolutions, and testimony made by the ILWU be incorporated by reference at this point in the committee's record.

At the eighth biennial convention of the ILWU, held in San Francisco from April 4 to April 9, 1949, the delegates unanimously adopted the following resolution on statehood:

"The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union reiterates its 1947 convention statement calling for immediate statehood for the Territory of Hawaii.

"We are convinced that the Territory of Hawaii has met manyfold all the necessary prerequisites for immediate statehood. We reaffirm our past statements which demonstrate that Hawaii is better equipped politically, socially, culturally, and economically for statehood than any of the Territories which subsequently became States, were at the time of their admission into the Union.

"We call upon the Congress to pass legislation immediately granting Hawaii the long overdue political status of statehood. We particularly urge all Congressmen and Senators from the Pacific Coast States to support such legislation, as many are now effectively doing."

We urge speedy enactment of this long overdue legislation.

RAILWAY LABOR EXECUTIVES' ASSOCIATION,
Washington 4, D. C., May 1, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,

*Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Room 224, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Railway Labor Executives' Association desires to be recorded, in connection with the current hearings on H. R. 49, as being in favor of the granting of immediate statehood to the Territory of Hawaii. This association consists of the chief executive officers of 20 national and international railway labor organizations which represent a very large majority of the railroad employees of this country. The names of these organizations are shown on this letterhead.

We believe the people of Hawaii are entitled to full citizenship. The granting of statehood to Hawaii, through enactment of the pending bill, would, in our opinion, strengthen our country, both economically and from the standpoint of national defense.

We ask that this letter be made a part of the record of the hearings now taking place.

Respectfully yours,

A. E. LYON, *Executive Secretary.*

WASHINGTON 9, D. C., May 5, 1950.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATORS: As the executive director of the joint conference committee on public relations for the Baptists of the United States, acting for the four national conventions, the Southern Baptist Convention, the Northern Baptist Convention, the National Baptist Convention, and the National Baptist Convention, Inc., with a total membership of 16,000,000, I am writing you.

I wish to submit the petition of the Hawaii Baptist Convention that Hawaii be admitted into the Union as a State. I am informed by the president, the Reverend Joe W. Bailey, that this convention at its annual meeting in November of last year went on record with a strong resolution favoring statehood in the conviction that by whatever standard to be applied, Hawaii can qualify for statehood.

The Hawaii Baptist Convention is in cooperation with the Southern Baptist Convention, one of the constituents of the joint conference committee, and it is therefore, appropriate that I transmit this information and petition to you with the earnest request that you give it full consideration. It would occur to me that this rather large body of Hawaiian citizens would represent a cross section of public opinion in Hawaii and is entitled to full evaluation.

Most respectfully yours,

JOSEPH M. DAWSON,
Executive Director.

COUNCIL FOR SOCIAL ACTION,
CONGREGATIONAL CHRISTIAN CHURCHES—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington 6, D. C., April 26, 1950.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: We are glad to know that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hold hearings on legislation which would grant statehood to Hawaii. On behalf of the Council for Social Action of Congregational Christian Churches, we wish to express the hope that prompt, favorable action will be taken on this legislation, and request that the following statement be included in the record of the hearings:

The general council of Congregational Christian Churches, which is the highest body of our denomination, in June of 1948 approved the following resolution in support of measures to grant statehood to Hawaii:

Whereas the Congregational Christian Churches have worked for a Christian civilization in Hawaii since the going of the first American board missionaries in 1820; and

Whereas these and other influences emanating from the United States and from the varied races of the islands have brought about an economic, political, and cultural maturity marked by a high degree of interracial understanding; be it

Resolved, That we, the general council, heartily commend the desire of the people of the islands to undertake the responsibilities and privileges of statehood, and earnestly request the next Congress of the United States to move with all speed toward that end.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS B. KEEHN,
Legislative Secretary.

WOMAN'S DIVISION OF CHRISTIAN SERVICE,
BOARD OF MISSIONS, CHURCH EXTENSION, THE METHODIST CHURCH,
New York, N. Y., May 2, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: At the General Conference of the Methodist Church held in Boston, Mass., in May 1948 the following recommendation concerning statehood for Hawaii was adopted:

"Resolved, That the General Conference of the Methodist Church go on record as heartily favoring work toward early statehood for Hawaii in accord with the principles of our church, the Constitution of our Nation, and the universal laws of brotherhood and justice; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States; the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and to the Delegate in Congress from Hawaii."

Also the woman's division of the Methodist Church has consistently supported statehood for Hawaii.

We do urge you and members of the committee to report out bill H. R. 49 as soon as possible so that this Territory might have statehood status.

Sincerely yours,

ELEANOR NEFF.

YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, NATIONAL BOARD,
New York, N. Y., May 1, 1950.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Because the matter of statehood for Hawaii is to come before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this week, we are writing to tell you of the continued interest of the Young Women's Christian Association in this matter. At their eighteenth convention at San Francisco in 1949, the delegates pledged themselves to work for statehood.

The Young Women's Christian Associations are well organized in the Hawaiian Islands. They cooperate very effectively with the associations on the mainland and keep their problems and interests constantly before the national board of the YWCA.

It is not perhaps necessary to point to the excellent war record of Hawaiians in the Armed Forces during the recent war nor to point to the fact that not a single act of sabotage or fifth-column activity was committed in Hawaii before, during, or after the attack on Pearl Harbor. The record of the islanders on both the war and home fronts was unexcelled in performance, loyalty, and cooperation. It is a matter of common knowledge that a race riot has never occurred in the Hawaiian Islands and that in spite of the presence of many different ethnic groups there is little evidence of race hatred, segregation, or discrimination.

Important as the latter point is, however, perhaps even more important is the obvious intellectual capacity of the majority of the citizens of the Hawaiian Islands. Many Hawaiian business and industrial girls and women attend YWCA conferences on the mainland. Their participation in discussions and recreation, and many and varied evidences of group leadership are so outstanding that the capacity of their people for full citizenship is undoubted.

We, therefore, hope that the matter will be favorably reported to the Senate as soon as possible, and would appreciate the insertion of this letter in the record of the committee's hearings.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. ARTHUR FORREST ANDERSON,
Chairman.

DENVER, COLO., March 13, 1950.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The Denver Post is most anxious to see Hawaii-Alaska statehood bills approved and count on your support of these measures in the best interests of American well-being and security.

PALMER HOYT,
The Denver Post.

LARAMIE, WYO., May 1, 1950.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate Building.

DEAR SENATOR: This newspaper is behind Hawaiian statehood bill today when it comes up for vote. We hope you will give it serious consideration.

Sincerely,

BOB CRUZEN,
Managing Editor, Laramie Republican.

ROCK SPRINGS, WYO., May 1, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate Office Building:

Understand vote appears eminent with respect to statehood for Hawaii. Hope you will vote for same. Kind regards.

MALCOLM CONDIE,
International Board Member, District 22, U. M. W. of A.

RIVERTON, WYO., May 1, 1950.

Senators J. C. O'MAHONEY; LESTER C. HUNT; WYOMING REPRESENTATIVES:

Urge favorable vote for Hawaii statehood—Thanks.

THE RIVERTON TIMES,
Riverton, Wyo.

LARAMIE, WYO., May 1, 1950.

HON. J. C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

If consistent with your ideas, would appreciate your earnest support of the Hawaii statehood bill.

J. R. SULLIVAN.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 15, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.,*

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY:

In accordance with the invitation contained in your kind letter of April 4, 1950, I am attaching herewith a statement on H. R. 49, the bill for Hawaiian statehood, for inclusion in the record of the hearings of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Yours respectfully,

KENNETH H. MANTEL.

STATEMENT BY KENNETH HASKELL MANTEL, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am in favor of H. R. 49, a bill to provide statehood for the Territory of Hawaii.

The admission of Hawaii as a new State would bring to all the people of the United States a new, interesting American culture; it would confirm our belief in the principles upon which the United States was founded; it would bring to the United States an economically sound State; it would infinitely strengthen our Pacific defense, and would be a bulwark against the totalitarian forces which threaten to engulf the nations of the Pacific; but, above all, it would bring the American way of life closer to the people of Hawaii.

Since the annexation of Hawaii by the United States in 1898, the Territory has grown rapidly in population, agriculture, exports, and, as an island paradise, has been one of the foremost tourist attractions of the world. Today, Hawaii stands as a powerful force of American democracy. The sugar and pineapple industries provide an income of many millions of dollars annually for the people of the Territory; Hawaii has contributed no small sum in taxes; Hawaii is a veritable treasure of potential wealth. In these economic aspects alone the island has proved herself worthy of statehood. If Hawaii is admitted on an equal footing with the other States of the Union, she will measure up to our standards, and will be a welcome member of the Union.

In her internal affairs, in her Territorial government, in her people, her agriculture, her industry, her trade—in all these aspects of American life, Hawaii has been active and growing. It is incumbent upon us to fulfill our promise, and grant statehood to the Territory of Hawaii.

The people of Hawaii have time and again expressed their overwhelming desire to be admitted to the Union. The legislation which is before us has been supported by the President, Members of Congress, American organizations, newspapers and, I feel sure, the majority of the American people support Hawaiian statehood.

There are, however, some persons and some selfish groups which have consistently opposed the will of the majority and have fought against granting statehood to the Territory.

Let us examine some of their arguments for delaying, or rejecting statehood for the Territory of Hawaii.

One of the chief complaints is that Hawaii, being a group of islands, is incongruous with the continental United States. What that fact has to do with the incorporation of Hawaii into the Union is something which I fail to perceive. I think that we should point out that Hawaii is closer by air to the west coast than is Washington State to Florida. Consider the speed of travel between New York and Virginia when those States were admitted to the Union. I am compelled to dismiss the argument of incongruousness, with the thought that the persons offering such a poor excuse for delaying statehood are thinking in terms of 1787 rather than 1950.

There are, however, more serious points of opposition to statehood for the Territory of Hawaii. Some persons are concerned with the fact that Hawaiian race composition differs from that in the United States. These opponents forget that during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, millions of immigrants arrived at our shores; they forget that in the United States we have millions of citizens of many races and nationalities, with many backgrounds, and that these many millions have contributed so much to our American way of life. I feel proud and happy that in Hawaiian statehood, we may add new cultures and new races; I would be glad to study and learn and exchange ideas with the people of Hawaii. The people of Hawaii have proved themselves to be Americans, and I would welcome them.

Some persons have a fear that in considering Hawaiian statehood, we would set a precedent which would require us to automatically admit all other territories and areas under our control; they fear that many islands in the Pacific, some small and barren, would necessarily be admitted as States in the Union. Such fear has no basis. No person considers that statehood is a matter to be taken lightly; on the contrary, statehood for Hawaii has been carefully and thoughtfully considered for many, many years. It is only with a real assurance that a territory is ready and prepared and worthy of statehood, that it may be considered; Hawaii has thus been proved beyond any doubt. We must consider Hawaiian statehood solely on the merits of Hawaii and without any attached strings or fears.

A few opponents to statehood claim that Hawaii is a desert island—barren and uninhabited, or with a population so small that it is hardly noticeable. Nothing could be further from the truth. The fact is that Hawaii covers an area more than 6,000 square miles, with a population of over a half million, a size and population which exceeds several States, and which far exceeds many States when they were admitted to the Union.

The opponents say that Hawaii will be a parasite and will depend upon the other States for existence. Such a statement is utter nonsense. In the first place, Hawaii is economically independent, and will depend upon other States only as all the States in the Union depend upon each other, and work for their mutual benefit. Moreover, Hawaiian industry and agriculture, amounting to many millions of dollars a year, contributes a great deal to the United States Treasury. It should be remembered that although the people and the industries of Hawaii are taxed, they have no voiced representation in the Congress.

One of the recent forms of opposition to Hawaiian statehood has been that claim that Hawaii is under the domination of communism. The persons using this claim do not wish to fight communism anywhere—they merely fear communism; they loudly voice their fear in the disguise of communism in Hawaii. No; these persons will not fight communism; they can only fear it. The statement that Hawaii is under the domination of Communists is untrue. Neither the United States nor any Territory of the United States is under the domination of communism and never will be. Let us therefore examine the charge that Hawaii is riddled with Communists. Let us also remember that there are more Communists and their sympathizers in the city of New York than there are people in the whole Territory of Hawaii. There are Communists in Hawaii, just as there are Communists elsewhere in the United States; and it is our job to fight them. The people who believe in the free democracy which we have earned and fought for in the United States do not want any part of communism; the people of New York do not want communism; the people of Hawaii do not want communism. With statehood within reach, the people of Hawaii have increasingly fought against communism in their Territory. I feel very strongly

that with statehood granted to Hawaii, the fight against communism will continue. Communism has no hold on Hawaii; I challenge anyone to prove otherwise. I wish to unequivocally state that the greatest defeat which faces the Communists today is statehood for Hawaii.

In the above paragraphs, I have listed some of the main points against statehood for Hawaii, and I have tried to show, in each instance, why they are not justifiable in terms of American democracy.

I have indicated the reasons for passing H. R. 49, and I have included points which show that Hawaii has achieved the requisites which are necessary for statehood. I firmly believe that Hawaii is ready for statehood; Hawaii has earned the privilege to become a State; the Hawaiian people are eager for statehood; the American people are strongly in favor of statehood.

I strongly urge that H. R. 49 be favorably reported out, and that the United States Senate pass this bill.

To Hawaii: Aloha.

ARMONK SCHOOL,
UNION FREE SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 5,
Armonk, N. Y., April 17, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'MAHONEY: I understand the statehood bill for Hawaii is before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

During the school year of 1947-48, I was exchange principal of the Kapalama School in Honolulu. Wishing to make the most of it, I studied the human relations and the various aspects of the lives of the people. I studied the pros and cons of statehood. Of the economic and comparative statistics, I am sure you are well informed. My conclusion, without reservation, was "Why not statehood?"

I wish the rest of the world, especially the 48 States we have, could learn from the islands, how to live in peace and brotherhood. They are setting an example of the ideal practice of democracy for the rest of us. I found, in a most unusual racial mixture, more patriotism, Americanism, human kindness, right living, and a better educational system teaching democracy, than I have been able to find anywhere in the mainland. So many times Hawaii is at a disadvantage because it is not a State. I have been arranging to have films of their schools sent here to teach our children democracy and brotherhood. I have been and am giving illustrated lectures, gratis, with colored slides that I took while there. I am sure if the Senators could visit the schools of Hawaii in session, there would be little doubt left in their minds.

I would appreciate having this letter inserted in the hearing of May 1 as a witness favoring statehood. If not, I hope my small opinion about the matter will help those of you who are responsible to some extent for furthering the movement, to lend your efforts to bring statehood for Hawaii into being.

Thank you for your patience and for the consideration you may give.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD C. CRITTENDEN.

RITCHIE, SEIG & VINARDI,
Omaha 2, Nebr., May 2, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*Chairman of Committee on the Interior,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: It has been my intention to appear voluntarily to testify on behalf of Hawaiian statehood but court appointments prevented, so I have decided to write you a letter which I would appreciate your inserting in your committee report on statehood for Hawaii.

Two years ago as a member of the committee of 16 which prepared the permanent draft of the Democratic national platform, I voted in favor of statehood, but without the use of the word "immediate," not realizing the importance and fairness of that word to the people of Hawaii. Later, when the general committee met, the Honorable Chuck Mau made a most stirring speech which convinced me and the others who were members of the large committee, that the word "immediate" should be inserted in the Democratic national platform.

The national convention ratified this promise and I heard no objection from any source to that plank in our platform.

Later that summer I visited Hawaii and was very favorably impressed by everything, but before my visit I had had a personal visit with one of the members of your committee for whom I have the highest regard and personal consideration and he convinced me that there was a strong danger of communism and disruption to the public life of the islands if we should grant immediate statehood. While I was there I did not meet, as I should have done, all sections of the population and was limited in my views to a few good friends and their acquaintances. Some of them were strong for statehood and had no fear whatsoever for the so-called Communist danger, while others "saw red." As a result I inadvlsely expressed myself as opposed to Hawaiian statehood, not having made any deep study of the subject, in fact, not expecting any publication of my views. I was promptly called to time by one of the great newspapers of Hawaii and then began to study and think about the problem.

On my return to Omaha I met a group of university students going to mid-western and far eastern schools. Among them were some boys who were attending Creighton University in Omaha, which at that time had an enrollment of 70 from Hawaii. These boys knew of my foolish objection as voiced in the paper and made it their business to become acquainted with me and as a result I acquired a most valuable group of friends from all of the races now inhabiting Hawaii. All of them, however, are 100-percent American in thought, word, and action. They are young people of whom the Nation can well be proud and whose very presence in the islands assures an American point of view and an American domination better in my opinion than that in our home States, because they appreciate what America has, while we too often take it for granted and let it go at that.

Through the acquaintance of these boys I have become acquainted with a number of the parents and I now know boys from Hawaii attending Creighton, University of Nebraska, Iowa, Wisconsin, Northwestern, Illinois University, Chicago University, Springfield College and the college in Hartford, Conn., and elsewhere, and I have yet to see anyone who has any of the wild-eyed ideas that I have encountered among our native citizens in colleges and universities.

As chairman to the Democratic Party in Nebraska in 1946 to 1948 I came in contact with some of the "wild ones" and observed their irrational thinking and behavior. I have never seen any student from Hawaii entertain such notions.

I have discussed this matter with other citizens who have made trips to Hawaii during the past 2 years and none of them have returned with any fear similar to that expressed by a member of your committee. Most of them are strong for Hawaiian statehood; none opposed.

In my opinion which is now based upon a wide acquaintance of Hawaiian citizens of all races and a real consideration of the Communist question, Hawaii is safer from Communist infiltration than any of our mainland States.

The objection has been made that Hawaii is separated from the mainland and, therefore, should remain, I suppose, subordinate to whims and wishes of the politicians, with all due respect to politicians. That argument should not hold water. As I understand it, when Hawaii joined forces with America, the American representatives who handled the matter promised early statehood. It seems to me that 52 years or more is not early statehood and that any further delay on this source is inexcusable, though there is some strong compelling reason which I cannot see exists here to prevent the fulfillment of such a promise. In fact, it seems to me that Hawaii furnishes us the greatest opportunity to acquire a group of citizens who are thoroughly oriented to America and her institutions and yet have ties in the lands of the East where America should look for her future.

European countries are so devastated from the World War that they need help from us much more than any nation in the Orient. In 1940 after two trips to the Orient, I had a request from Secretary of State Cordell Hull to call on him. He asked me questions about my trip and among the things he said to me which I have never forgotten was that America must look to the Orient and to oriental trade to keep up and maintain her present standard of living and keep her factories running and her people employed; that Europe would come out of the World War then progressing a ruined country and would be a drag upon America for several generations, while the Orient would not be. He elaborated on this idea for some 20 minutes and I was convinced and am convinced that he is right. Consequently any action which is fair, such as the admission to statehood of

Hawaii would be to the oriental rights, is one of the greatest guaranties of success of American ideas and the ideals in the Orient and in world affairs.

One of the boys who was here last year and who is now attending an eastern school, wrote me yesterday commenting on his visiting with two outstanding citizens of Switzerland who are receiving their education in America. He told me that they had said, and that he thoroughly agreed, that America is the most democratic of all nations and he said he was bursting with pride and with pleasure at the prospect of maintaining America on its present democratic level, so that his children and grandchildren might enjoy what he is enjoying today in spite of the fact that, of course, there are differences of opinion and problems to solve. I think this is one of the best expressions I have received from anyone, written unconsciously but illustrative of the views of the Hawaiian generation which is now coming into power.

The separation of Hawaii from the mainland should not have any terror for anyone. The thousands of boys from Hawaii who are attending universities on the mainland and will return to take places of leadership in Hawaiian life, guarantee that they will have the best of American ideals and will see that the government of Hawaii as a State functions in the same manner as the men who founded America expected it to do.

I could write more because I am thoroughly convinced of the justice of immediate statehood and of its special advantage to America and her future, and I trust that your committee will recommend this bill and that the United States Senate will accept it and pass it.

Cordially yours,

WILLIAM RITCHIE.

(Senator Butler has submitted the following clippings from the Honolulu press, dealing with the Territorial biennial Democratic convention held April 30, 1950:)

[From Honolulu Star-Bulletin, May 1, 1950]

ONE FACTION, BEATEN IN VOTE SHOWDOWN, BOLTS CONVENTION, SETS UP NEW "REGULAR" GROUP

The Hawaii Democratic Party stands sundered today into two parts—both alive and seeking recognition from the national party.

Factual pressures built up ever since the ILWU first urged its members into the party in 1947, exploded with full force at 4:15 p. m. Sunday.

Thereafter the Democratic Party in Hawaii was operating at two bases.

One was at the Kalakaua Intermediate School, Kalihi.

The other was at the VFW clubhouse, 1812 Kalakaua Avenue, Waikiki.

Each side acclaimed itself as "regular."

Each side maintains that it will get support and recognition of the national party.

MORE THAN 100 WALK OUT

More than 100 old-line Bourbons made a stormy exit from the party's regular biennial convention to form a new anti-Communist faction.

The old liners, led by Honolulu Supervisor Ernest N. Heen and Harold W. Rice, former Maui senator, promptly started a convention of their own at the VFW Hall in Waikiki.

The original convention continued at the Kalakaua Intermediate School in Kalihi.

Both drew up platforms, passed resolutions, and elected Territorial central committees.

BOTH WHACK COMMUNISM

Both platforms hit communism, though the language of the walk-out group was much stronger. Both lauded President Truman's administration and endorsed statehood.

Each side repudiated the "right wing" and "left wing" labels informally tagged on them and it was true that each included a mixture of delegates such as to make any labeling difficult.

The original convention repudiated Gov. Ingram M. Stainback, endorsed Mayor John H. Wilson as his successor, and "fired" the two Democratic National Committee members from Hawaii who backed up the walkout—Representative Charles E. Kauhane and Mrs. Victoria K. Holt.

The walk-out group declared all existing precinct clubs dissolved and started setting up a brand-new party machinery of its own.

NO STAINBACK ENDORSEMENT

It praised Governor Stainback but significantly avoided endorsing him for reappointment.

Its members stressed they are not a pro-Stainback faction, that they actually have many members who oppose the Governor.

Both groups now will bid for approval and recognition from national Democratic headquarters in Washington, D. C., and both sides claim assurances of victory on this score.

The walk-out group reported talked by phone with Governor Stainback and Representative Kauhane in Washington before bolting.

It was said the Governor approved the plan to bolt.

It now plans for Mrs. Holt to leave for Washington Wednesday to lay its case for recognition before the national party officials.

In Washington Mrs. Holt will join Charles E. Kauhane, Democratic national committeeman, who is there on statehood business.

Though both have been ousted by the Kalihi convention group, their supporters say the national party will not support their expulsion.

HEARING REPERCUSSIONS

The issue that dynamited the two factions apart—after hours of frequently noisy, clamorous, undisciplined haggling—related to communism.

Maurice Sapienza, leader of the Young Democrats of Hawaii, moved for the expulsion from the regular convention of 15 delegates who face contempt citations for refusing to tell the House Un-American Activities Committee whether they are Communists.

When this was voted down, 171 to 94, and 170 to 87 in 2 standing votes, Maui's former Senator Harold W. Rice—according to a prearranged plan—elbowed through the aisles to the convention microphone:

"If the majority here would like to go along the way they're going, a group of us feel it is very unfortunate for the Democratic Party, but we feel we should have no part in a convention of this kind," he said.

With the old liners clustered around him, the towering Maui leader then marched from the hall.

Many spectators went with them, coming down from the auditorium gallery.

CONFLICTING CLAIMS

Later, the walkout group claimed 147 of the 485 delegates said to have been represented at the original convention, either in person or by proxy.

The original convention said only about 109 had gone. Part of the difference was accounted for by a number of contested seats, to which two delegates had been elected.

The 350 or so delegates who continued to be represented at the original convention either in person or proxy apparently agreed with Jack H. Kawano, former ILWU stevedore leader, that the real, underlying purpose of the Communist charges is to split and weaken the labor movement.

"Many of the guys that you heard named (on the contempt list) are not Communists. I know them personally—they are not Communists," Kawano told the convention.

LONG MAKES TWO SPEECHES

Acting Gov. Oren E. Long found himself in the position of making two speeches.

Before the split, he had urged the regular convention to "lay the foundation for success" by stressing the points of general agreement within the party and minimizing the disagreements.

But a few hours later Governor Long was with the walkout convention, telling them: "A development of this kind is sometimes essential. * * * I am confident that out of this action will come a stronger Democratic Party in Hawaii."

FEUD SPLITS RANKS

The split tore bitterly through the party. Arthur K. Trask went with the walkout group. But his brothers, James and David, stayed with the original convention.

Other figures in the walkout included John Akau, Jr., Lawrence Shigeura, and other A. F. of L. members; Mrs. Thelma Monaghan, Oahu women's leader; former Senator Clarence Crozier and former Representative John E. Pires, both of Maui; Harry B. Kronick, Edward Berman, Richard K. Kimball, Foreman Thompson, and Honolulu Supervisor Richard M. Kageyama, admitted ex-Communist.

Those who stayed in the original convention were a mixture of ILWU members, city hall leaders, and small-business men for the most part.

Included in the group that stayed were at least five legislators—Senator John G. Duarte and Representatives Mitsuyuki, Kido, Earl A. Nielsen, Tom Tagawa, and James K. Trask.

The group that stayed also included five constitutional convention delegates—James K. Yamamoto, Teruo Ihara, Earl A. Nielson, Frank C. Luiz, and James K. Trask.

Others who stayed included Mrs. Jennie Wilson, wife of the mayor; Honolulu Public Prosecutor Charles M. Hite, and Federal Judge Delbert E. Metzger.

HITE EMPHASIZES POSITION

Mr. Hite emphasized that he stayed in the Kalihi convention because he does not believe in penalizing the "contempt crowd" (union members and others) until their guilt is proved.

This goes back to the proposed purge of Democrats who refused to testify before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. Hite said: "I am as much opposed to communism as anybody. I remain with this group in the hope of preventing a party split and keeping the door open for the return of those who walked out this afternoon."

He said also that if he is elected party chairman, he will be free to act as his conscience dictates.

"I haven't asked a vote of anybody," he declared.

[From Honolulu Star-Bulletin, May 1, 1950]

CENTRAL COMMITTEE WILL WAIT UNTIL MAY 14 TO NAME ITS OFFICERS

The central committee elected by the original Democratic convention will wait until May 14 to name its officers.

Its members decided early today that they were too sleepy to tackle the problem and that—besides—it would be best to let emotions cool and let the present storm blow over.

The May 14 central committee meeting in Honolulu thus will have to elect a chairman and other officers and two national committee members.

(The convention "fired" the two incumbent national committee members—Representative Charles E. Kauhane and Mrs. Victoria K. Holt.)

Thus, the only step the original group took toward 1950-52 organization was the election of a new central committee.

Twelve of the thirty members are reelected. Eighteen are new.

Four members of the group face possible citation for contempt of Congress—Kameo Ichimura, Robert K. Murasaki, and Thomas Yagi, of Maui, and Jack H. Kawano, of Honolulu.

The committee will include:

First district, east Hawaii: Kazubisa Abe, Dr. E. M. Kuwahara (reelected), George Martin, and Edward Y. Wingate (4).

Second district, west Hawaii: Susie Caitano and Earl A. Nielsen (reelected) (2).

Third district, Maui County: Kameo Ichimura, Edward Kushi, Robert K. Murasaki, Thomas Yagi (reelected), and Mamoru Yamasaki (5).

Fourth district, Oahu: Godfrey F. Affonso, Jr. (reelected), David A. Benz, Akira (Sunshine) Fukunaga, Jack H. Kawano, Philip Minn, Dr. Ernest I. Murai (reelected), Gorman F. Noland, and Edward P. Toner (reelected), (8).

Fifth district, Oahu: O. Vincent Esposito, Charles M. Hite, Mitsuyuki Kido (reelected), Lahu Ah Chew (reelected), Chuck Mau (reelected), Takaichi Miyamoto (reelected), James Murakami, and James K. Trask, (8).

Sixth district, Kauai County: Manuel S. Henriques, Tom Ouye (reelected), and Omi Oyama (reelected), (3).

The permanent officers of the original convention all were elected without contest after the walk-out.

They were:

Chairman, John A. Burns, Oahu.

Vice chairmen: Edwin A. DeSilva, Hawaii; John G. Duarte, Maui; Mrs. John H. Wilson, Honolulu, and Omi Oyama Kauai.

Secretary, Mitsuyuki Kido.

Assistant secretary, Daniel T. Aoki.

Sergeant at arms, Henry B. Kukona.

Earlier, the election of a temporary chairman—before the walk-out—brought the clearest test of strength of the day.

Representative Earl A. Nielsen of west Hawaii was elected temporary chairman by 319 to 161 over Honolulu supervisor, Ernest N. Heen, who later led the walk-out group.

A set of committee assignments that the walk-out group claimed was stacked against them included John A. Burns, credentials chairman; Charles M. Hite, rules chairman; Gorman F. Noland, platform chairman, and Kazuhisa Abe, resolutions chairman.

[From Honolulu Star-Bulletin, May 2, 1950]

LEFT-WING DEMOCRATS ENDORSE MAYOR JOHN WILSON FOR GOVERNOR

Mayor Wilson was enthusiastically boosted for Governor Sunday by the Democrats who stayed at Kalakaua School Sunday in convention.

The so-called left wingers coupled this with a stinging slap at Governor Stainback. They denounced him as unfit for reappointment.

Here's the text of the resolution they adopted:

"Whereas the term of the present Governor of Hawaii ends in August of this year; and

"Whereas it is probable that a new appointment will be made by President Harry S. Truman in succession to the incumbent, Ingram M. Stainback; and

"Whereas such appointee will be a member of the Democratic Party; and

"WILSON RANKED FIRST

"Whereas in previous appointments during Democratic national administrations there has never been a native of the Hawaiian Islands appointed Governor of Hawaii; and

"Whereas John H. Wilson, present mayor of the city and county of Honolulu, has long been considered the ranking Democrat of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the said John H. Wilson has been elected to the office of mayor four times by popular vote; and

"Whereas John H. Wilson served the Democratic Party of Hawaii as a member of the Democratic National Committee for more than 32 years; and

"SHOWED ALLEGIANCE

"Whereas John H. Wilson has always demonstrated his allegiance and loyalty to the Democratic Party through his appointment of efficient and capable Democrats to positions in the city and county government; and

"Whereas John H. Wilson has not only established a fine record as a public official, but in his professional capacity as an engineer has contributed immeasurably to the welfare of the people generally through the creation of lasting permanent improvements; and

"Whereas John H. Wilson commends the prideful respect and devotion of the Hawaiian people whose blood flows also in his veins, and the esteem and admiration of the other races of Hawaii nei; and

"Whereas it is the faith and conviction of this territorial convention of the Democratic Party that no citizen of Hawaii can better serve her in the supreme executive office of the Territory: Be it hereby

Resolved, That we, the delegates of the Democratic Territorial Convention in 1950 here assembled, do endorse the said John H. Wilson for appointment as Governor of Hawaii.

"APPEAL TO TRUMAN

"And be it further

"Resolved, That we appeal to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, in the name of the Democratic Party of Hawaii, that he appoint the said John H. Wilson Governor of Hawaii; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; to the Honorable Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior of the United States; and the Honorable William M. Boyle, Jr., chairman of Democratic National Committee."

[From Honolulu Star-Bulletin, May 2, 1950]

POLITICAL ROUNDUP OF 1950—INSIDE FACTS ON CHE "CONTEMPT CROWD"

Here's an inside fact about the showdown in the Democratic Party Sunday.

The 15 delegates who had defied the house Un-American Activities Committee were urged by some Democratic Party liberals to take a back seat, if not resign.

"If you can't resign," it was suggested, "at least get up and make a statement that you are not a Communist."

They not only declined, they later played some of the leading roles in the Democratic convention.

BOUSLOG ACTIVE

Four were elected to seats on the central committee. Their attorney, Harriet Bouslog, was a frequent speaker from her front row seat.

Although not a delegate, Dr. John E. Reinecke, ousted school teacher, was in day-long attendance at the sessions, along with others cited by the Un-American Activities Committee.

The whole effect was to greatly simplify the task of anyone wanting to hang a Red label on the convention—and this apparently was undertaken knowingly, willingly and deliberately.

When the showdown came, the liberals in question didn't walk out. But they privately felt the party had been hurt to the point where its chances of winning the 1950 election are nil.

COMPLETE SURRENDER

Behind the decision to stay was an apparent feeling from the extreme left-wingers that nothing but complete surrender would satisfy their critics.

In preference to this, they were willing to explode the party's hopes for a 1950 victory, and an alliance with the group that walked out.

Although the liberals didn't like it, many stayed with the "contempt crowd" when the walkout came.

"SUNSHINE" SHINES TWICE

Only man to to elected to two Democratic central committees in one day is Akira (Sunshine) Fukunaga, AJA war veteran.

Both the Kalihi and Waikiki conventions put him on their governing boards. Mr. Fukunaga himself attended neither convention. He said he had to spend the day entertaining visiting dignitaries from the AJA veterans' group.

He is "greatly honored" but hasn't had time to decide whether he should refuse either one or both of the selections, he said Monday to the Star-Bulletin.

[From Honolulu Star-Bulletin, May 4, 1950]

WILSON CALLS DEMO SPLIT "STAINBACK ROW"—MESSAGE TO INTERIOR CHIEF RAPS AT HAROLD W. RICE

Mayor John H. Wilson has answered the charges of "Communists" and "fellow travelers" hurled at the so-called left-wing Democrats here.

The mayor sent a long radio statement Wednesday night to Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman.

He compared the Sunday walk-out by the right-wing Democrats, at the Territorial convention, to the Dixiecrat revolt and walk-out in the Democratic National Convention at Philadelphia in 1948.

Harold W. Rice, Maui Democrat and walk-out leader, is a "characteristic revolter," says the mayor. Mr. Wilson told Secretary Chapman that Rice has twice in the past bolted Republican sessions.

That was when Rice was a Republican.

He switched to the Democratic party only a few years ago.

TELEPHONED CHAPMAN

Mayor Wilson's message backs up a phone conversation he held with Secretary Chapman Wednesday morning.

Mr. Chapman went back before the Senate statehood hearings to give a fuller report on the party split here.

MAYOR'S APPRAISAL OF SPLIT

Mayor Wilson tells Secretary Chapman that the split in the party Sunday was not over right and left leanings, but over Governor Stainback.

He says the anti-Stainback wing was that which stayed at the original convention scene—Kalakaua Intermediate School, Kalihi.

The pro-Stainback group, he says, bolted and went to the VFW hall for its own convention.

WILSON ENDORSED FOR GOVERNOR

At Sunday's convention, Mayor Wilson was endorsed by the so-called left-wing group for Governor.

Simultaneously this faction bitterly denounced Governor Stainback, opposing his reappointment.

This was the faction that stayed at Kalakaua School.

The other faction—that which bolted, and set up a rival convention at Waikiki, gave the Governor cautiously measured praise, but it did not endorse him for reappointment.

TEXT OF MESSAGE

Here is the text of the mayor's radiogram:

"In answer to your inquiry the Democratic convention walk-out was of the same nature as the Dixiecrat's at Philadelphia.

"Our convention was made up of 485 duly accredited delegates present in person or by proxies out of a total of 541 elected by 147 precinct clubs in the Territory in accordance with party rules.

"This convention actually divided pro-Stainback and anti-Stainback. The first test was the election of Earl Nielsen, Democratic member of the Territorial legislature, as temporary chairman, 319 to 161 for Ernest N. Heen.

"Among delegates were 15 who had declined to testify before congressional un-American Activities Subcommittee in Honolulu last month.

"Following a motion to adopt the report of the credentials committee an amendment was proposed by a pro-Stainback delegate to unseat these 15.

"The vote against the amendment was more than 2 to 1.

"RICE LEADS WALK-OUT

"Harold Rice, delegate from Maui, and the closest political ally of Stainback, immediately went to the mike and called for the walk-out, then led 86 delegates carrying 46 proxies, or a total of 129 votes, from the convention to a prearranged meeting place on the other side of town.

"This left 356 votes in the regular convention, or 113 more than a quorum.

"There was no Communist charge against the 15 delegates. The effort to remove them was based only on their declining to testify. Many of them are positively known as non-Communists.

"ONLY FIVE INVOLVED

"It should be noted that only 5 precincts out of 147 were involved in the contests.

"Neither labor nor the Communists have a vestige of domination of the party here although labor has strong influences.

"Our central committee of 30 members for the past 2 years has contained 13 businessmen, 3 attorneys, 3 doctors, 2 farmers, 2 accountants, 2 real estate operators, 1 cemetery custodian, and 4 ILWU members.

"Our new Territorial committee, elected at this convention, includes 12 businessmen, 5 attorneys, 3 doctors, 1 housewife, 1 farmer, 1 veterans' club officer, 1 institution administrator, 1 unemployed, and 5 ILWU members.

"CHARACTERISTIC REVOLTER,

"Of five ILWU members in the new committee, three are from Maui, bailiwick of Harold Rice who led the revolt.

"Harold Rice is a characteristic revolter. From the time he was able to vote he was a member of the Republican Party.

"In the 1920 Republican Territorial convention he walked out with the entire Maui delegation. He was elected to the Territorial senate from Maui as a Republican in 1941.

"Seven years ago, he crossed with Territorial leaders of the Republican Party, withdrew, and joined the Democratic Party.

"REFERS TO KAGEYAMA

"While the pro-Stainback faction sought to remove 15 delegates because of suspicions of loyalty, they took with them a delegate who admitted before the Un-American Activities Committee that he had joined the Communist Party while a member of the board of supervisors of Honolulu and had signed a loyalty oath that he never was a Communist.

"ADVISED BY STAINBACK

"The board of supervisors has requested this member to resign and he had refused on advice from the Stainback faction. It is significant that Governor Stainback in his false charges of Communist domination of the Democratic Party here, has the support of the morning Republican newspaper.

"The regular Democratic convention, following the withdrawal led by Mr. Rice, unanimously adopted resolutions giving unqualified support to the national Democratic Party and to the national administration headed by President Truman and urging immediate granting of statehood by the United States Senate.

"The convention adopted a platform containing a ringing attack on and a denunciation of communism. Letter follows.

"JOHN H. WILSON.

"MAY 3, 1950."

[From Honolulu Star-Bulletin, May 2, 1950]

CAPITAL DEMOS WON'T COMMENT ON LOCAL SPLIT

National Democratic headquarters in Washington said today it will be at least a few days before it will have any comment on the split in the Democratic Party here.

It told the Associated Press it is still awaiting full information on what happened in Hawaii.

It will not have any comment until after this is received.

There may not be any comment even then, it was added.

OTHER DEVELOPMENTS

Here are other late developments in the local party rift:

1. Old-line party members exulted today over Interior Secretary Chapman's endorsement of their walk-out and predicted national Democratic headquarters will follow suit.

2. Their emissary, Mrs. Victoria K. Holt, now will leave Wednesday morning to lay their case for recognition, and a full report of the walk-out convention, before leaders in Washington.

3. The Kalihi convention Democrats said their first personal appeal to national leaders will be when Lau Ah Chew attends the national Democratic conference in Chicago May 13-15. He hopes to talk to National Chairman William Boyle, Jr., there.

4. Other Hawaii Democrats expected at Chicago include Supervisor Chuck Mau, of the Kalihi faction, and Representative Charles E. Kauhane, of the Wai-kiki faction, both in Washington now for statehood.

5. Reports that Interior Secretary Chapman had endorsed the walk-out obviously stunned Kalihi group leaders like Lau Ah Chew, Charles M. Hite, and Jack A. Burns, who indicated they believe Mr. Chapman must have spoken without full information.

6. The Kalihi group promised to accept the walk-out members at county meetings of women tonight and of the full county committee Thursday night at Central Intermediate School—but the Waikiki convention members indicated they won't attend.

Mrs. Thelma Monaghan, who was chairman of the women's division and now heads the women's division of the new group, urged women against signing up with the old party tonight at Central Intermediate School.

RESOLUTION TO BAN COMMUNISTS PENDING

It was learned reliably that the new regular Democrats likely will write into their platform within the next few days a resolution calling upon Congress to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States.

H. W. Rice is expected to propose this addition today to Arthur K. Trask, chairman of the platform committee. The resolution is prompted by the conviction of Democrats here that the Communist Party in America is in reality not a political party, but a "finger" of the Russian-controlled Communist International.

7. The Kalihi group will draft Jack Burns for reelection as Oahu County chairman on Thursday, says Wilfred K. Oka, county secretary.

8. The Waikiki walk-out group claims promises that more members from the Kalihi convention will come over and join it.

Harold W. Rice, one of the leaders of the dissidents, has been approached by quite a few delegates who remained Sunday with the original convention about the possibility of switching their affiliation to his side.

None of them, however, has made any definite commitments, he said, but added that he will talk with them again and may announce some desertions from the left-wing camp today.

TWO ARE UNDECIDED

At least two delegates—one of them elected to the central committee—told the Star-Bulletin Monday night that they are undecided about remaining with the faction headed by Lau Ah Chew.

Dr. Edward Kushi, of Wailuku, Maui, said his election as a central committee-man "was a surprise to me."

The doctor, who did not attend the convention at Kalakaua Intermediate School, said he knew nothing of his selection "until I read it in the papers."

And Dr. Shigeru Miura, also of Wailuku, Maui, said he, too, is undecided which side to support. He said he will talk with Mr. Rice Saturday and may take a stand after that.

Mr. Rice, a former senator from Maui, expects 75 percent of the party's Territorial membership to swing over to his newly formed group.

FOURTH DISTRICT CONTROL?

John Akau, active in Manoa politics, said he thinks the new faction has control of 35 of the 38 precincts in the fourth district.

BOTH SIDES TO SEEK APPROVAL

Both the factions will seek approval from the national Democratic organization. Each now claims to be the regular Democratic Party in Hawaii.

[From Honolulu Star-Bulletin, May 3, 1950]

THIRD PARTY MAY ARISE FROM SPLIT IN DEMOCRATIC RANKS

The rupture in Democratic ranks here may lead to three parties going on the election ballot this fall.

Election officials, who won't be quoted by name, say it is a definite possibility. They say the main problem might be to choose a designation if both Democratic factions demand to be listed as Democrats.

The election law provides for more than two parties to go on the ballot, as well as for a nonpartisan group.

Attorneys say unofficially that the only apparent test a party has to meet to get its name on the primary ballot is to meet the following definition contained in the law:

"Party—an association of voters united for the purpose of promoting a common political end or carrying out a peculiar line of political policy which maintains a general organization throughout the Territory, including a regularly constituted central committee and county committees."

MEET PARTY STANDARDS

The Republicans and the left wing convention Democrats meet the legal definition of a "party."

The Democrats who walked out of Sunday's convention, only to reconvene at Waikiki and set up a central committee, also will meet party qualifications soon. This group is engaged in building up county committees and precinct clubs.

National-party recognition will play a big role in settling the fate of either faction.

Harold W. Rice says that most Democrats on Maui are prepared to switch allegiance to the new group. Mr. Rice is one of the leaders of the new-group Democrats.

A spokesman for the new faction was asked: "If the other group was recognized by Washington, will you form a third party?"

He replied: "We will follow the dictates of national-party officials. But it is entirely inconceivable that the national party will recognize the group headed by Lau Ah Chew."

Lau Ah Chew is the chairman of the Democratic Territorial central committee.

He also was chairman at the opening of the convention which met Sunday at Kalakaua Intermediate School.

SHIFTS ARE FORESEEN

The spokesman for the new faction said Mr. Lau had "slandered" Representative Francis E. Walter (Democrat, Pennsylvania) when the House patronage chief was here with the House Un-American Activities Committee probe.

Lau Ah Chew criticised Chairman Walter sharply. He said that Walter shouldn't presume to lecture the Hawaii Democrats on how their party should be run.

Representative Walter countered with a blast: "Lau Ah Chew evidently isn't my kind of a Democrat."

If the new group receives national party recognition, the spokesman said he believes the "vast majority of Democrats of Hawaii" will follow their party leaders in Washington.

The Democrats who invite contempt citations by declining to testify before the House probers, in effect, would be without a party.

And he asserted that the credentials committee of the new group probably would ban Mr. Lau.

ABOUT A THIRD PARTY

He admitted that the "extreme leftist group" of the other faction might form a third party, but he discounted their potential importance.

There have been hints from some ILWU sources this week that the left wing convention group might prefer to continue as a separate party if it loses national Democratic status.

In this case, it might take a name like the Progressive, Labor, or Liberal Party.

EFFECT OF NEW NAME

But—if this happened—it is clear the left-wing group would be deserted by many persons who stuck with it when the walk-out came Sunday.

Several said as much when asked Tuesday, but would not be quoted.

Mr. Lau would not comment on the possibilities of his faction becoming a third party if Washington repudiates it.

GOING TO CHICAGO

He's preparing to seek approval of the Democratic National Committee for the actions of the party here.

He will soon go to Chicago on this mission.

There's a meeting of the party committee and other party bigwigs there. President Truman will deliver a party address.

[From Honolulu Star-Bulletin, May 9, 1950]

DEMOCRATS MOBILIZING FOR CHICAGO BATTLE

A reluctant candidate appears today to be leading the race for chairman of the "left wing" of the Democratic Party here.

The election will be held Sunday.

The central committee was elected at the convention 10 days ago. But election of its officers was purposely delayed in the hope that the feud-clouds would disappear.

They haven't. In fact, several new ones have blown up.

HITE HAS BACKING

Several party sources say that if the central committee election were held today the winner would be Charles M. Hite, Honolulu public prosecutor.

Mr. Hite tossed his hat into the chairmanship race weeks ago.

HITE UNCERTAIN

But after the party split April 30 he changed his view, and has been uncertain whether to accept.

Mr. Hite, a conservative Democrat, had offered himself before the split as a compromiser who could get along with all factions.

Since the rupture, he says he is doubtful whether he can be of much use to the party.

Pinning "Red" and "Communist" labels on the old party faction has helped swing sentiment in favor of Mr. Hite within the past week.

The Honolulu public prosecutor is a very conservative man, who has been more of a right winger than a left winger, so far as his political philosophy is concerned.

Other members of the left-wing group feel his presence as chairman would help allay the "Red" charges.

LAU LOSING FAVOR

The 1948-50 chairman, Lau Ah Chew, who is seeking reelection, has been losing favor on the same account.

Mr. Lau took several pot shots at the Un-American Activities Committee while it was here.

His reelection would lend color to the Red charges, even though Lau himself is not considered a radical by any stretch of the imagination.

Both Mr. Lau and Mr. Hite may be in Chicago at the time of the central committee meeting when a new chairman will be elected Sunday. But Mr. Lau says it will go on without them.

Although there have been hints that Mr. Lau might decide not to seek reelection, he said Monday that he is still in the race to succeed himself.

MAU STILL SILENT

Aside from Mr. Hite and Mr. Lau, the next most likely candidate for chairman of the old party group is Honolulu Supervisor Chuck Mau.

In 1948 Mr. Mau declined to run for the office.

He hasn't made any statement this year, and is not expected to be present Sunday. He, too, will be at the Chicago Democratic gathering.

It is doubtful if much support will build up behind Mr. Mau, unless he sends word of his willingness to accept. Several Democrats say they wouldn't elect a man chairman while his back was turned.

Both sides in Hawaii's Democratic civil war moved up new forces today for the possibly decisive battle of Chicago this week end.

News that the insurgent right-wingers had added Governor Stainback to their ranks was quickly followed by word that the Mayor Wilson-ILWU left-wingers will augment their forces.

At a meeting tonight, the Mayor Wilson-ILWU leaders will discuss flying Public Prosecutor Charles M. Hite and/or Jack A. Burns to the battleground.

Chicago is chosen because the highest Democratic brass—President Truman, National Chairman William M. Boyle, Jr., and their lieutenants—will be there this week end.

The occasion will be the national Democratic conference and Jefferson jubilee from Saturday through Monday, billed as the most important Democratic meeting of 1950.

VICTORY IN BALANCE

If either side in the Hawaii civil war can win the nod of approval from the leaders there, it will be almost certain of ultimate victory in the war here.

The nod will carry with it the promise of administration favors and patronage.

Thus the heavy armed exodus from here to the cocktail bars and smoke-filled rooms of Chicago's Blackstone hotel for a hefty round of throat-cutting.

The Mayor Wilson-ILWU group so far appears outnumbered. Even with Hite and Burns on the scene, it will only have four warriors to a likely six for the rebellious right-wingers.

HERE'S THE LINE-UP

Here's the latest line-up:

Wilson-ILWU old party group: Chuck Mau (sure); Lau Ah Chew (possible); Charles M. Hite (possible); Jack A. Burns (possible).

Stainback-Rice right wing: Ingram M. Stainback (sure); Representative Charles E. Kauhane (sure); Mrs. Victoria K. Holt (probable); Ernest N. Heen (probable); John K. Akau, Jr. (sure); Maurice Sapienza (sure).

The right-wingers also have some modern secret weapons—sound recordings of various Democratic gatherings here, which John Akau has taken with him in the hope national leaders will find time to listen.

Both sides are equipped with lots of paper ammunition—resolutions, platform, letters—to use in their bombardments.

RIGHT-WINGERS HAD LEAD

Right-wingers started with an apparent early lead in the original Washington skirmishes after the April 30 outbreak of the civil war.

Interior Secretary Oscar L. Chapman apparently gave them his blessing. But Mr. Chapman has since talked with Mayor Wilson and appears to have retreated to a more neutral position.

The Battle of Chicago thus may start with the sides nearly even.

STAINBACK TELLS PLANS

Governor Stainback will stay in Washington through Friday and attend the national Democratic conference in Chicago this week end.

He phoned his decision to Acting Gov. Oren E. Long Monday afternoon.

Mr. Stainback said statehood occupied all this time last week and that he will spend this week in Washington on other Territorial matters.

PROBABLE SUBJECTS

Mr. Stainback did not enumerate these matters but they probably include five judgeship appointments, return of military lands to the Territory, unemployment, and—presumably—his own reappointment.

Mr. Long said he did not discuss the Democratic Party split with the Governor and does not know what stand, if any, has been taken on the matter by national Democratic headquarters.

[From Honolulu Star-Bulletin, May 10, 1950]

ILWU NAMES ABSENT FROM DEMO LIST—BOUREONS ELECT OFFICERS AT SURPRISE EVENING MEETING

Old line Democrats of the Mayor Wilson-ILWU faction today announced an entirely new list of party officers, apparently intended to erase any charges of Communist domination.

The local officers are all island businessmen, and no ILWU members have any place in the leadership.

New national committee members are Mayor Wilson of Honolulu and his secretary, Mrs. Harriett B. Magoon.

The new Territorial officers are: Chairman, Chuck Mau, Honolulu attorney and supervisor; vice chairman, Representative Earl A. Nielsen; Kona, Hawaii, photographer; treasurer, Gorman F. Noland, Honolulu manufacturers' representative; secretary, David A. Benz, young business executive.

The officers were elected in a surprise secret meeting that ran until the early hours this morning at the home of Dr. Ernest I. Murai, a central committee member.

Members had publicly maintained the pretext that the election would not be held until an announced meeting next Sunday. This meeting now is canceled.

ORGANIZATION DELAYED

The election originally was to have been held on April 30, immediately after the Territorial convention. But because of the split in the party and the high running feelings at the time, the group delayed organization.

Except for a brief announcement today by Charles M. Hite, Honolulu public prosecutor, no information has been released publicly about last night's prolonged meeting.

Guessing was that the fight for national recognition and the question of handling members accused of Communist activity played a major role in the arguments. Other central committee members professed ignorance as to what happened and referred all queries to Mr. Hite.

He limited himself to announcing the new officers.

He declined to say who will represent the group at the national Democratic meetings in Chicago this week end.

"My lips are sealed," he said.

Mr. Hite himself, the mayor, and John A. Burns, Oahu County chairman, have been mentioned as possible delegate to Chicago.

MAU ON MAINLAND

Mr. Mau, the new chairman, is already on the mainland and will be at Chicago.

It is doubtful if the mayor's physician will permit him to make the trip. And Mrs. Magoon, the new national committeewoman, said today she has no plans to go to Chicago.

Mr. Hite said all elections last night were unanimous except that of Mrs. Magoon. After she was elected over Mrs. Lehou Kempa, her election also was made unanimous, it was stated.

Lau Ah Chew, party chairman of 1948-50, said he announced at the meeting last night that he did not seek reelection.

Mr. Hite, originally a candidate for chairman, also apparently withdrew.

Mr. Hite said about 15 of the 30 central committee members actually attended the meeting, and said 24 votes were represented, including proxies.

Earl A. Nielsen was the only neighbor islander present.

Others included David A. Benz, Jack H. Kawano, Philip Minn, Dr. Ernest I. Murai, Gorman F. Noland, Edward P. Toner, O. Vincent Esposito, Charles M. Hite, Representative Mitsuyuki Kido, Mr. Lau, Takaichi Miyamoto, James Murakami, and James K. Trask.

BOYLE LEAVES MATTER UP TO LOCAL GROUP

(By William H. Ewing, Star-Bulletin Bureau)

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 10.—William M. Boyle, national Democratic chairman, said today the Hawaii dispute will not come before the national committee in Chicago this week end "in any way, shape or form."

Mr. Boyle, who is leaving for Chicago tonight for the Democratic celebration beginning Saturday and climaxed Monday night by President Truman's speech, said:

"The national committee does not settle local disputes."

The national chairman said further that it is his understanding that no credentials dispute is involved which might bring the matter before the credentials committee.

"If there is any question of the authority, propriety or legality of the credentials of anyone representing the party in Hawaii, then that matter might be properly considered by the credentials committee," he said.

"If so, the credentials committee will be functioning."

"But I have no expectation that it will be taken up by the credentials committee."

Another spokesman for the national committee said that the only other manner in which the dispute might be brought before the national authorities, would be through the resolutions committee.

"But that is usually a matter of saying that Joe Doakes is a good guy and Joe Smith is a bum," he explained, "and I would say that such a resolution would be tabled."

Other sources remarked that the party is engaged in what amounts to a gigantic send-off in the 1950 campaign, with the President involved, and local disputes aren't likely to be given much attention.

SHOW-DOWN ON SEATING OF DELEGATES MAY OCCUR

Hawaii Democrats—although National Chairman Boyle doesn't want it—may try to force their local dispute on the Democratic National Committee Saturday.

It appears probable today that two sets of committee members from Hawaii will claim seats in the meeting.

Representatives Charles E. Kauhane and Mrs. Victoria K. Holt will demand to retain the seats to which they were elected in 1948 for 4-year terms.

Mayor Wilson and Mrs. Harriet B. Magoon—either in person or by proxy—apparently will bid to replace them on the grounds that they supported a walk-out from the party convention in Honolulu April 30 and are no longer true Democrats.

Since the April 30 walk-out, the Democratic Party has been divided into two separate factions, each claiming to be the true party.

Representative Kauhane and Mrs. Holt represent a right wing group that accuses the other of being Communist dominated.

Mayor Wilson and Mrs. Magoon represent a faction that is composed of small-business men and ILWU members, some of whom face citations for contempt of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Both local factions have apparently decided on Chicago as the scene for the first big shown-down in their bid for national favor.

Whichever faction can win national backing will undoubtedly be the eventual winner in the local party row.

The backing carries with it administration favors and patronage.

Representative Kauhane and Mrs. Holt—elected national committee members in 1948 for 4 years—will be armed with resolutions from the insurgent right-wing Democrats affirming their status.

But the delegates from the so-called left wing will have opposite resolutions to offer to the national committee, declaring the two seats vacant.

They will try to have the national committee recognize the mayor and Mrs. Magoon as new members from Hawaii.

These two were elected just last night. It is considered certain their proxies will be in Chicago even if they are absent.

The committee that elected wouldn't discuss its Chicago plans today.

What the national committee does when the rival claims are submitted may provide the first hint of its policy toward the local row here. However, National Chairman Boyle indicated today he wants to have nothing to do with local party disputes.

COMPROMISE POSSIBLE

Many observers expect an effort at compromising and getting the two local factions back together.

Opinions differ as to the rules governing the case.

Charles A. Rice, now a "neutral" in the factional fight, thinks the local ousters of Representative Kauhane and Mrs. Holt may not be valid.

Mr. Rice—a member of the Republican National Committee 35 years ago, before he became a Democrat—says he thinks it is up to the national committee, not the local convention, to fire members before their terms expire.

Senator William H. Heen, Democratic National Committee member prior to 1948, is not sure what rules will govern.

Mayor Wilson, himself national committeeman for 16 years, thinks the ousters are valid.

The mayor says the Kalakaua school resolutions in effect read Representative Kauhane and Mrs. Holt out of the party as well as out of their jobs. This takes the matter out of national committee hands, says the mayor. The resolutions do not specifically spell this out, however.





